



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 146

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 12, 2000

No. 46

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,

April 12, 2000.

I hereby appoint the Honorable STEVEN C. LATOURETTE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Reverend Chip Lingle, Faith Lutheran Church, Savannah, Georgia, offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, from the endless bounty of Your love for Your creation, You provide all that we need. As Your people, we confess our trust in You, believing that You care for our welfare.

"In God we trust" we proclaim on our currency. Yet the people of this Nation also put their trust in these elected representatives. We trust that they will do Your will and provide justice to ensure a quality of life that You provide.

Protect these honorable representatives, give them Your wisdom so that their decisions may reflect Your desire for Your people. Give them a quiet assurance and guide them in the difficult times. May Your will be reflected through them and may Your people be blessed by their leadership. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCNULTY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. MCNULTY led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOMING REVEREND CHIP LINGLE TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

(Mr. KINGSTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I introduce the chaplain of today, the Reverend Chip Lingle.

Chip comes to us from Faith Lutheran Church in Savannah, the mother city of Georgia, founded in 1733. He has been there with his wife, Ruth, for 5 years.

Reverend Lingle grew up in North Carolina and did his undergraduate studies at the University of North Carolina in Raleigh. He received his master's from the Lutheran Theological Seminary of the South in Columbia, South Carolina and has served in churches in North Carolina, South Carolina, and in Georgia.

I have gotten to know the Lingle family over the past years and have become great friends with his son Ben, who also served as a page here. Ben goes to Jenkins High School and is a member of the National Honor Society. He is a member of the marching band and concert band. He is on the Mock Trial team and has been very active in Boy Scouts and church activities and plays in a rock and roll band called Sweet Pig.

Ben is also here with us today; and so is Reverend Lingle's mother, Isetta Lingle, who is with us in the gallery.

So please join me in welcoming Reverend Chip Lingle.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain 10 one-minute requests from each side of the aisle.

Members are reminded to refrain from references to those spectators in the gallery.

WAR AGAINST METHAMPHETAMINE ACT OF 2000

(Mr. CALVERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, it is no secret that methamphetamine has reached epidemic proportions in our Nation. Last year alone, we saw almost 6,000 lab seizures affecting nearly every State in the Nation.

It is time we declare war against meth. This deadly drug has thousands of innocent victims. Ordinary families find their property ruined or health at risk by the deadly chemicals used to make meth. These chemicals destroy soil and plants, contaminate drinking water, and poison the air we breathe.

We know we have reached a crisis situation with meth. The statistics are there. Forty-four States reported nearly 6,000 meth lab seizures in 1999 alone. And most disturbing, over 1,200 children were found during these lab seizures.

We must face the problem head on. My legislation does just that. The War Against Meth Act ensures that we stop meth production but punish those who would put innocent victims and the environment in danger. Today we introduce this bipartisan legislation with over 60 cosponsors.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to finally thank all the law enforcement men and women that are fighting this battle on

This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H2125

a daily basis as we declare, once again, war on meth.

TAX CODE IS UNAMERICAN

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, the Tax Code is unAmerican. It is also so big it would give King Kong a hernia.

But the bad stuff is evident. The Tax Code rewards dependency, subsidizes illegitimacy, kills jobs, and chases companies overseas.

Now, if that is not enough to overload your hard drives, check this out: Experts say that the Tax Code is needed because it modifies economic behavior.

Beam me up.

If the Founders wanted to modify economic behavior, they would have contracted with Sigmund Freud to write the Tax Code.

I yield back the ego, the id, and the super ego of our kinky Tax Code.

WE NEED TO WAGE WAR AGAINST METH

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year an illegal meth amphetamine lab exploded on the 12th floor in a hotel in downtown Reno.

So today, Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my strong support for a bill which my colleague the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT) just spoke about and will be introducing today. His Working and Reacting Against Methamphetamine Act will wage a full scale and meaningful war against the methamphetamine epidemic that has spread throughout America.

Mr. Speaker, last year, 1999, 44 States reported close to 6,000 meth lab seizures. Obviously, this is a growing problem that we must address.

The War Against Methamphetamine Act will increase the penalties for producing both amphetamine and methamphetamine. The bill will also provide law enforcement officials with the necessary tools and resources to effectively combat the meth epidemic.

We need to protect our children from the latest drug epidemic located in our open backyards. I encourage our colleagues to support the War Against Meth Act and its multifaceted approach to closing down meth labs nationwide.

WAR AGAINST METHAMPHETAMINE ACT

(Mr. REYES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the War

Against Methamphetamine Act introduced by my colleague the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

We have all heard the staggering numbers related to meth labs across the country. The most troubling figure, in my mind, is the number of children that have been found at the lab seizure sites, 1,252 children at the sites.

This legislation increases penalties related to amphetamine and creates new and additional penalties for the production of these dangerous drugs. This bill also establishes a national center that would be created in conjunction and coordination with the Drug Enforcement Agency, the L.A. Clearinghouse, and the El Paso Intelligence Center, which is, by the way, located in my district.

The National Center will collect, analyze, and distribute all seizure information sent in by law enforcement officials across the country. This National Center will allow law enforcement officials across the country to instantly access vital information on these kinds of seizures.

I urge all my colleagues to cosponsor this bill and support our local law enforcement.

WILL PRESIDENT AL GORE PARDON PRESIDENT BILL CLINTON?

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, in an editorial in today's Washington Post, we hear once again that the new Independent Counsel Robert Ray is serious about indicting the President after he leaves office.

The Post says that, "A plausible indictment of Mr. Clinton, who has never publicly acknowledged the extent of his wrongdoing, could surely be drawn."

It goes on to say, "Some opponents of impeachment argued during the congressional proceedings that Mr. Clinton's susceptibility to criminal prosecution after his term in office was a powerful reason not to remove him."

And the Post editorial continues in talking about disbarment and a \$90,000 fine, arguing in the end that Mr. Ray should exercise restraint.

Mr. Speaker, to me there is a more important question. The Associated Press reported yesterday the administration announced that the President will not pardon himself. But if the Vice President is successful in his bid to succeed his boss, would he then turn around and pardon him?

The real question is, will President AL GORE pardon President Bill Clinton? I think he owes it to the American people to explain.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind all Members that

it is not in order to address the personality of the President or the Vice President of the United States.

FREE AND FAIR ELECTIONS PARAMOUNT TO OUR SYSTEM OF GOVERNMENT AND THOSE OF CENTRAL AND SOUTH AMERICA

(Mr. McNULTY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McNULTY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield to my friend, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD).

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would just make the point that, whether Republican or Democrat, a theme that our country is built on is the idea of free and fair elections. And if what is going on in Peru right now is able to stand, then the Fujimori government in Peru will be built on unfree and unfair elections.

Indeed, a lot of controversy is going on right now about a young boy and whether he should or should not go back to Castro because of freedom. If we look at what is going on, again, in Peru, a cancer will start to grow that America should be no part of.

So I would say that, if what stands, we need to look at stripping aid from the supplemental, we need to look at blocking aid with the drug war, we need to look at blocking access to international financial institutions. Because free and fair elections are paramount to our system of government and to governments throughout Central and South America.

PASS H.R. 1070 BY THIS MOTHER'S DAY

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, despite education on preventive measures and early detection, the rate of cancer among women has continued to increase at an alarming rate. Every 64 minutes a woman is diagnosed with reproductive tract cancer. And just today, one in eight women will be diagnosed with breast cancer.

Our colleague, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK), shared with us how she is among the fortunate who can afford life-saving treatment after her diagnosis.

We have encouraged low-income mothers and daughters to have mammogram screenings and early detection measures. But when these medical tests show an unfavorable diagnosis, who is there to ensure that they receive the life-saving treatment they so desperately need?

Mr. Speaker, our Nation's low-income women living with breast cancer cannot wait any longer. H.R. 1070 gives the States an optional Medicaid benefit

to provide treatment to low-income women screened and diagnosed with breast or cervical cancer through the CDC early detection program.

Mother's Day is May 14, and the most valuable gift that Congress can give American women is a fighting chance at beating cancer. I hope that my colleagues will work for passage of H.R. 1070 by this Mother's Day.

REUNIFICATION OF FATHER AND SON

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, what I believe the American people would like to see as we move through this week is a simple reunification of a father and a son, Elian Gonzalez and Juan Miguel Gonzalez, without force, without violence, bringing the two families together, emphasizing the importance of family, helping us as the American people reaffirm our values that father and son belong together.

I hope we, as Members of the United States Congress, whose jurisdiction is not in play at this time, and appropriately so, will encourage the reunification of father and son, something that Americans have believed throughout the centuries.

WAR AGAINST METHAMPHETAMINE ACT

(Mr. LATHAM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the War Against Methamphetamine Act introduced today by our colleague from California (Mr. CALVERT).

In the upper Midwest in Iowa, there has simply been an explosion of methamphetamines that is affecting our young people, our families, our communities, and being the most destructive element that we have seen in many, many years.

There are four legs to fighting this problem. One is for interdiction, another enforcement, education, and then treatment. What this bill does is gives us the tools to help with enforcement by increasing penalties for those selling, by making sure that we are able to track people who are making the drugs, and by increasing penalties to those who are causing tremendous environmental damage with the labs that are being put in place to make this horrible drug.

This is a great measure to move us forward in this great battle, and I would hope the entire House will join in supporting this measure.

1015 TAX CODE

(Mr. SHERMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, our economy is important, and we need sound policy, not soundbites. As the tax due date approaches, what we are getting is soundbites, and perhaps the worst is what is going on in the Committee on Ways and Means this week where they are considering a proposal to delegate rewriting the Tax Code to a commission, not to Members of Congress, who are supposed to report that code out on July 4, 2004, and then our Internal Revenue Code would, by the terms of this bill, expire by the end of 2004. This means our economy will be in total disarray. Who would invest in municipal bonds if they do not know if the advantages of investing in them will be swept away? Who will start an R&D tax project if the credit is going to be swept away or might be? And who would count on fiscal responsibility in a society that is going to give its Congress just a few months to rewrite the entire Tax Code after it hears from a commission?

What we see instead is an elaborate ruse that prevents us from reforming the Tax Code one section at a time.

ALZHEIMER'S/OKLAHOMA MEDICAL RESEARCH FOUNDATION

(Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce remarkable news from the great State of Oklahoma. Today, the Oklahoma Medical Research Foundation will announce a breakthrough discovery in the fight against Alzheimer's disease. Researchers at OMRF discovered the enzyme which is found in our brains and which scientists believe is directly responsible for the Alzheimer's disease.

Not only did Oklahoma researchers pinpoint the cause of Alzheimer's disease, they have also designed a way to stop it. If this breakthrough can successfully be transformed into a drug, Alzheimer's could become a manageable disease, like high blood pressure, diabetes, not the terminal disease we know now. This discovery will have a profound impact, since 4 million Americans suffer from Alzheimer's and another 19 million members of their families suffer along with them.

I hope one day my kids can view Alzheimer's the same way my generation views polio, a terrible disease that was conquered with scientific advances. Basic research forms the building blocks of science and medicine and this type of breakthrough clearly illustrates why the Federal Government's investment in basic research is invaluable. Again, I am excited to report this and the many coming announcements

of good news from the Oklahoma Medical Research Foundation.

METHAMPHETAMINES

(Mr. BACA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of legislation introduced by the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), my colleague from the Inland Empire. As a cosponsor of the bill, I join him in the war against meth labs. This bill increases penalties for drug criminals and puts them out of business. Meth labs create harm to a lot of our children and our communities. It contaminates drinking water. It contaminates the soil in our area.

There are more than 2,500 meth labs in the Inland Empire. That means children living at home exposed to chemicals with drug dealers, your children playing next to meth labs. Your spouses or your loved ones are at risk. That means 13 lab fires and explosions in San Bernardino County last year. That means homes blowing up and police being placed at risk. This is why the San Bernardino Sheriff's Department supports this bill. It is time to say no to drugs. Support this bill.

BREAST AND CERVICAL CANCER TREATMENT ACT

(Ms. DUNN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1070, the Breast and Cervical Cancer Treatment Act. This legislation provides States the option of providing Medicaid coverage to uninsured, low-income women who are diagnosed with breast or cervical cancer as part of a screening process by the Centers for Disease Control.

While the CDC's National Breast and Cervical Cancer Early Detection program helps identify women with breast or cervical cancer, it does not provide any coverage or any treatment. These women patients not only face a terrifying battle with cancer but they also must find ways to pay for the care they need. H.R. 1070 rectifies this problem by helping low-income women get the medical treatment they need. The bill is vital to help save the lives of women throughout our Nation. It would make the best gift Congress could offer if we were to pass H.R. 1070 by Mother's Day. I am pleased that this legislation soon will be considered on the floor of the House. It is a good bill and will do the job. I ask my colleagues to support this legislation.

TAX RELIEF

(Mr. KNOLLENBERG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, with a determination to save the American dream for the next generation, the Republican Congress has turned the tax-and-spend culture of Washington upside down and produced a balanced budget with tax cuts for the American people. Now that the Federal Government's financial house is finally in order, the big question facing Congress and the President is, what is next? With the average family still paying taxes, more in taxes than it spends on basic necessities, the obvious answer is tax relief for the American worker.

As we move from the era of budget deficits to budget surpluses, some people in this town will argue that we can afford to spend this money on new programs. However, that is the mindset that got us in trouble in the first place. For our children's sake, for common sense sake, it must be rejected once and for all. I urge, Mr. Speaker, my colleagues to continue fighting for the additional tax relief that the American people need and deserve.

A SIMPLER, FAIRER AND FLATTER TAX CODE

(Mr. CHABOT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, our current tax code is unfair. It taxes savings. It taxes marriage. It even taxes death. It is virtually incomprehensible, even to tax lawyers and to accountants. In fact it is even four times the length of the Bible. This week we have an opportunity to take a major step towards reforming our tax system. The House will consider H.R. 1041, legislation to sunset the Tax Code.

This legislation will encourage Congress to create a simpler and fairer and more reasonable tax system for Americans. It gives us a deadline to do it. Once this bill becomes law, the current Tax Code would sunset on December 31, 2004, and Congress must then implement a new Tax Code or reauthorize the current one we have by July 4, 2005. Our tax laws are complicated, unfair, and unreasonable. Let us work together to sunset our abominable Tax Code and replace it with something simpler and fairer and flatter.

COMMEMORATING 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF HAMPSTEAD VOLUNTEER FIRE DEPARTMENT

(Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the men and women of the Hampstead Volunteer Fire Engine and Hose Company No. 1 of Carroll County, Maryland. The fire company was founded on February 13, 1900, and will celebrate its 100th anniversary on April 15 of this year. The founders' goal was to establish fire pro-

tection for their little town. One hundred years later, the town has grown and the company has grown from just a few men to more than 100 active and associate members whose goal today is the same, to provide the highest level of fire and emergency medical service to their community.

From the daunting task of fighting fires to responding to accidents and emergency medical situations, the Hampstead volunteers have remained stalwart members of the Hampstead community. Keep in mind, these are volunteers who come to the aid of their neighbors day and night, without pay and oftentimes with complete disregard for their own well-being. I am certain the citizens of Hampstead join me in congratulating the Hampstead fire fighters and look forward to another 100 years of exemplary service.

TAX LIMITATION CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 471 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 471

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 94) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to tax limitations. The joint resolution shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) two hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary; (2) an amendment printed in the Congressional Record pursuant to clause 8 of rule XVIII, if offered by the Minority Leader or his designee, which shall be considered as read, and shall be separately debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Rules, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 471 is a structured rule providing for the consideration of H.J. Res. 94, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to tax limitations. The rule provides for 2 hours of debate in the House equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. The rule provides for one amendment printed in the

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD if offered by the minority leader or his designee which shall be considered as read and shall be separately debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. Finally, the rule provides for one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, with tax day arriving at the end of this week, there is certainly no better time for the House to consider this important constitutional amendment. The tax limitation amendment starts from this very simple premise that it should be harder, not easier, for government to raise taxes. The average American pays more in taxes than it does in food, clothing, shelter, and transportation combined. For too long, the tax burden imposed by the Government has been going up, not going down. I am very, very proud to sponsor this constitutional amendment.

Mr. Speaker, passage of this rule will allow the House to begin debate on one of the most serious matters to be considered by this House, an amendment to the Constitution of the United States. When our Founding Fathers met more than 200 years ago to draft what became the Constitution of the United States, there was agreement on what problems our Nation faced and our Constitution was drafted to address these problems.

In many instances, they wrote specific language protecting people from what at times could be an oppressive, intrusive, or overbearing Federal Government. They protected bedrock foundations to our liberty and freedom, such as life, the pursuit of happiness, freedom of speech and freedom of religion. Just as importantly, the Founding Fathers required certain actions and laws passed by Congress to obtain a supermajority vote, not just a simple majority because they foresaw that the people must overwhelmingly support some action.

Our Founding Fathers were so insightful and ingenious in their preparation of the Constitution that they enlisted within our system of checks and balances a Constitution which would clearly enumerate occasions where a supermajority would be appropriate as a guardian of the people. A vote of two-thirds of both houses, for example, is required to override a presidential veto. A two-thirds vote of the Senate is required to approve treaties or to convict an impeached Federal official.

But a two-thirds vote in Congress is not yet required for raising taxes. In my view, our Founding Fathers would recognize that under the current system there is an inherent bias towards raising taxes and might have supported this constitutional amendment.

1030

There has long been a bias towards raising taxes under the current system. Spending benefits are targeted at specific groups. These special interests successfully lobby Congress and the

President for more and more spending. Taxes, on the other hand, are spread among millions of people. Taxpayers usually cannot come together as efficiently as a special interest group with a specific appropriation in mind.

As Congress seeks to keep the budget in balance, yet spending has still remained high, the easiest answer always for Congress is simply to raise taxes.

The Federal budget is currently in balance, in part due to spending constraints by Congress, as well as hard work and global-leading productivity of American workers, but short economic downturns can be expected. Future Congresses may not be as fiscally responsible and return to the ways of deficit spending.

The easy answer then is to raise taxes.

Making it more difficult to raise taxes balances the options available to Congress and makes decisions on the size of government. It is critical that this balance be achieved. By requiring a supermajority to raise taxes, an incentive for government agencies would be created to eliminate waste, fraud and abuse and to create efficiency rather than simply turning to more deficit spending or to increase taxes.

It is important to remember that there was no Federal income tax when our Founding Fathers drafted the Constitution. Not until 1913 was the 16th amendment of the Constitution passed to allow Congress to tax the American people. The first tax ranged from 1 to 7 percent and only applied to the wealthiest Americans. Today, some taxes are collected by the Federal Government at a 50 percent rate.

Medieval serfs gave 30 percent of their output to the lord of the manor. Egyptian peasants gave 20 percent of their toils in their fields to the Pharaoh. God only required 10 percent from the people of Israel. Yet in America, Federal, State and local taxes eat up many times in excess of 40 percent of the average American's income.

The burden of tax rates is not only too high, but that is only half the story. As tax rates have increased, the heavy hand of the tax collecting branch of our government has been strengthened. It has been determined by our majority leader, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), that our Federal income tax collection agency, the Internal Revenue Service, sends out more than 8 billion pages of forms and instructions each year. Our Federal income tax collection agency is twice as big as the CIA and five times bigger than the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

No other institution poses such a threat to liberty than the Internal Revenue Service and our Tax Code, and this is all as a consequence that tax rates are too high and the Tax Code is too complex.

A constitutional amendment requiring a two-thirds vote to raise taxes would help alleviate some of this misfortune. Thomas Jefferson once wrote,

"The God who gave us life gave us liberty."

I imagine that Thomas Jefferson never envisioned such an intrusive agency as the IRS. Today, unfortunately, the reality is the IRS is a prevalent part of our daily lives, particularly this week with the April 15 tax deadline fast approaching.

Every year, Americans are taxed for billions and billions of dollars. Sometimes these taxes that are passed are retroactively done so. Sometimes they are passed from generation to generation and sometimes they are forced upon us even after death by the Federal Government.

So today, Mr. Speaker, I stand before my colleagues with a bipartisan coalition to put forth to the States a question of liberty. Will we make it harder for Congress to raise taxes on its citizens? Will we require a two-thirds vote of both Houses of Congress to pass a tax increase on to working Americans and children? Will we pass this amendment to the Constitution and require a supermajority, not just a simple majority to raise taxes?

This amendment will apply to all tax increases from the Federal Government, not just tax hikes. A two-thirds vote requirement would allow Congress to raise taxes in time of war or national emergency, but would simultaneously prevent the intrusive and penalizing tax increases that have been enacted with recklessness to fund government expansion over the last decades.

As we speak, several States of this great Union, including Arizona, California, Florida and Missouri, have adopted measures requiring that any tax increase by their legislature pass by a two-thirds majority. It is time that the Federal Government joins these States in listening to the voice of the American people. It should be harder to raise taxes. Had this amendment been adopted sooner, the four largest tax increases since 1980, in 1982, 1983, 1990 and 1993 all would have failed. That tax increase in 1993 was the largest tax increase in American history and it passed just by one vote. These tax increases totaled \$666 billion to the American taxpayer.

The bottom line of this debate, Mr. Speaker, is that we should make it more difficult to raise taxes on the American people. Those that oppose it will do so because they want to make it easier to raise taxes on the American people.

Mr. Speaker, this is the defining issue. Those Members who support this amendment are here to support the taxpayers of America. Those Members who oppose it today are here to defend the tax collectors of America. It is really that simple.

We hear rhetoric from opponents of this legislation citing jurisdiction, procedure, and a slew of other glossary terms but nothing can hide the reality that America and all taxpayers support a two-thirds tax limitation because

they want to make it more difficult to raise taxes.

Mr. Speaker, like many Members of this body I not only oppose raising taxes, I support making our Tax Code fairer, simpler, and flatter. The tax limitation amendment allows for tax reform and it provides that any tax reform is revenue neutral or provides a net tax cut. Also, any fundamental tax reform which would have the overall effect of lowering taxes could also still pass with a simple majority.

The tax limitation amendment also allows for a simple majority vote to eliminate tax loopholes. The de minimis exemption would allow nearly all loopholes to be closed without the supermajority requirement.

We may hear from opponents today, those who will be saying to make it more difficult to raise taxes that the Government would be unable to function if a supermajority is required. Well, Mr. Speaker, I would encourage Members to look back at their States. Fourteen States require a supermajority to raise taxes. Millions of Americans living in these States have enjoyed slower growth in taxes, slower growth in government spending, faster growing economies, and lower unemployment rates. Tax limitation can bring to all Americans those things that are benefits that are enjoyed by those living in tax limitation States.

This amendment protects the American people. It makes it harder for the Federal Government to raise taxes on its citizens and that is why I am here today.

Today we can take one step closer to regaining liberty and ensuring future generations the freedom of our Founding Fathers intended for all Americans to enjoy. This debate is about liberty. This debate is about requiring a two-thirds vote to raise taxes on America.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would remind my colleagues that this is a fair rule adopted by a voice vote yesterday in the Committee on Rules. It is the standard rule under which this proposal has been considered for years in the past. I urge my colleagues to support this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, my friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), for yielding me the customary half hour, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today marks the fifth year in a row that my Republican colleagues have dusted off this old same constitutional amendment just in time for tax day. At the end of the day, Mr. Speaker, we will probably mark the fifth year in a row that this amendment fails to garner the required two-thirds vote.

So why do my Republican colleagues continue to bring up this resolution year after year after year? They do not even bother to bring it to their own Committee on the Judiciary. I am glad

that my friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), spoke so long and explained it because this is the only debate we are going to have on the bill. It did not go before the Committee on the Judiciary.

Imagine amending the Constitution of the United States of America without one hearing before the basic committee in the Congress that would deal with that, the Committee on the Judiciary?

Well, here we go again. Mr. Speaker, if my Republican colleagues were serious they would fine-tune this amendment in a congressional committee. They would have hearings. They would mark it up, but this resolution has not been to the Committee on the Judiciary. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I will let my colleagues in on a little secret. This bill was just introduced last Thursday. The ink is still wet.

Given that the amendment is destined to fail again this year, as it does every year, it would seem that it is being offered not to effect change but really to affect the evening news, because even when my Republican colleagues had a chance to practice the preachings of this amendment, they did not.

We may recall at the beginning of the 104th Congress, my Republican colleagues changed the House rules to require a two-thirds majority for every tax increase. Mr. Speaker, guess what? Every time it came up, every time they have this tax increase, they waive the rule. I would say, Mr. Speaker, that if a rule is not to be obeyed in the House of Representatives that surely it is not worthy of being an amendment to the United States Constitution.

Back in the 1780s under the Articles of Confederation, the United States tried a supermajority. It did not work then. It will not work now.

The foundation of a supermajority is a mistrust, a mistrust of the ability of the majority of American people to govern; and I for one think that that mistrust is misplaced. Because of that mistrust, Mr. Speaker, a supermajority changes the very foundations of our government from a majority-run institution to a minority-run institution, and that is not what our Founding Fathers had in mind.

In the Federalist Papers No. 58, James Madison argued against supermajorities. Under a supermajority, he said, the fundamental principle of free government would be reversed. It would be no longer the majority that would rule. The power would be transferred to the minority.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, if this tax amendment were to pass, it would help the rich and hurt the middle- and lower-income people. Rich Americans get most of their government benefits in the form of tax breaks. The rest of the country gets their government benefits in the form of Social Security, Medicare, student loans, and unemployment insurance. This amendment would make it much harder to close

those tax loopholes for the very rich, and make it necessary to cut the benefits for everyone else.

Mr. Speaker, it would also make it much harder to strengthen Social Security, make it much harder to strengthen Medicare. In fact, it could even have the effect of reducing Social Security benefits.

In short, Mr. Speaker, it would shackle our government to the tax laws in effect today, with very little hope of changing them in the future. Whether for better or for worse and like so many of my Republican colleagues' proposals, the rich come out way ahead and everybody else pays the price.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment was a bad idea 5 years ago. This was a bad idea 4 years ago. This was a bad idea 3 years ago. This was a bad idea 2 years ago; and, Mr. Speaker, it is a bad idea today.

1045

So I urge my colleagues to oppose this annual tax day Valentine, this sloppy assault on our Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am really not surprised for us to be debating in this manner that what we are doing does not make sense, it is unnecessary, it is unwise, no one would be in favor of making it harder to raise taxes. It is bad for America, it is all for the rich. Well, in fact, the reason why we are standing up today is for the exact people that we have talked about that the minority says is bad for them.

There is a power model in this same vein that was followed and begun some 30 years ago. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER) from the Seventh District of Texas, now the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, when he came to Congress 30 years ago, the first bill that he dropped as a Member of Congress said that he would like to raise the earnings limit that was placed on senior citizens. For 25 years, he was not only called names and made fun of, but Members of the other side made sure that they said that is not necessary, it is for rich people. In fact, it was for the senior citizens of this country.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER) became the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means. The gentleman from Texas then held the first hearings that were necessary to begin the dialogue and the debate. Then this senior earnings limit began appearing on the floor of the House of Representatives because Republicans knew that it was important to senior citizens; and beyond that, it was simply fair and the right thing to do.

Several times, it was voted on on the floor of the House of Representatives. Our friends on the other side had an opportunity every time to vote against senior citizens in lifting this earnings limit.

Well, Mr. Speaker, what happened then is, because of efforts by the Republican Party where we quit spending every single penny of Social Security, the surplus, and we started putting it back into Social Security, my friends on the other side of the aisle began feeling a little bit queasy about who was making progress with the American taxpayer; in this case, it was the senior citizen of America.

Just 3 weeks ago, this House of Representatives passed 422 to nothing, unanimously in the Senate, that we would lift the earnings limit. The President of the United States signed this into law after vetoing this several times. The President said, boy, he wished we could have done more, could have done more for senior citizens, but not everybody is for making the same kind of progress. He recognized that there are honest differences on both sides of the aisle. Yes, we understand that honesty. We understand those honest differences today.

Today we are now in our 10th year of what may be a 30-year effort to make it harder to raise taxes. As usual, one side is going to be supportive of this, by and large, and the other side is going to drag their heels. But we are not going to be frustrated. We are not going to worry about what the rhetoric is. We are going to continue to stand up on the side of the taxpayer.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Stratford, Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), my colleague and assistant Majority Whip.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) for the time to speak in favor of this rule and for bringing this, and I also want to thank him for bringing this important issue to the floor of the House.

We have a chance today to cast a vote for the future. Two-thirds simple majority is, in fact, reserved for the most important of issues, including amending the Constitution, ratifying treaties in the Senate. The founders understood that the two-thirds majority was appropriate majority on those kinds of issues.

I am confident that this standard of importance would have been used to decide other things if there had been any perception of what those other things might have been.

There were issues that James Madison and others thought were important enough for a supermajority. If they had any idea of what the tax burden on American families would be today, this would have been one of those issues in that Philadelphia summer of 1787.

A two-thirds simple majority standard would guarantee that there was a consensus among Members of both parties that increasing taxes was a necessity. This bill has gone through the committee process over and over again. It was just pointed out by the other side that this same legislation has been rejected by the House a number of times. Well, to be rejected by the

House a number of times, it had to get to the House floor a number of times. It is the same bill that went through that committee process in the last Congress.

Today is the time to cast this vote. Today is the time to vote on this issue. I am grateful that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) in the Committee on Rules and the other committees have brought it to the floor today as they have.

By making it more difficult for Congress to endlessly reach into the pockets of working Americans, a two-thirds simple majority would require Members to be more careful in the dollars they spend. We should spend every dollar taken from American families with the utmost care, making it harder for this Congress and more likely for future Congresses to take that money, makes it more likely it will be spent with greater care, be more treasured as it comes here because it is coming right from working families.

In the 14 States which has implemented tax limitation standards, taxes and spending grew at a slower rate, while the economy and jobs grew at a faster rate than in the other States. That, Mr. Speaker, is not by accident.

Although the economy is presently strong, Federal taxes are still the highest they have been since World War II. The entire tax burden is the highest it has been in the history of the country. It is important to compliment this strong economic standard today by dealing with the future of taxes in America as this bill does.

The most recent States to pass tax limitation measures have done so with overwhelming voter approval. They would have met the two-thirds requirement because they met requirements of over 70 percent of their voters saying we want to see tax limits in our State.

Again, States with tax limitation supermajorities are adding economic opportunity at a rate faster than the other States. Job creators understand the stability that tax limitation brings to the economy. Mr. Speaker, the Members of the House today have an opportunity to show that we understand the importance of tax limitation for America's economy and the importance of tax limitation for America's families.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the rule, to support the bill, to make a stand for American families today and to make a stand for the future of America by putting this new supermajority requirement on the books and in the Constitution.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) for his engagement in this issue on the rule. I urge my colleagues to support this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 471, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 94) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to tax limitation, and for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Pursuant to House Resolution 471, the joint resolution is considered read for amendment.

The text of House Joint Resolution 471 is as follows:

H.J. RES. 94

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years after the date of its submission for ratification:

"ARTICLE—

"SECTION 1. Any bill, resolution, or other legislative measure changing the internal revenue laws shall require for final adoption in each House the concurrence of two-thirds of the Members of that House voting and present, unless that bill, resolution, or other legislative measure is determined at the time of adoption, in a reasonable manner prescribed by law, not to increase the internal revenue by more than a de minimis amount. For the purposes of determining any increase in the internal revenue under this section, there shall be excluded any increase resulting from the lowering of an effective rate of any tax. On any vote for which the concurrence of two-thirds is required under this article, the yeas and nays of the Members of either House shall be entered on the Journal of that House.

"SECTION 2. The Congress may waive the requirements of this article when a declaration of war is in effect. The Congress may also waive this article when the United States is engaged in military conflict which causes an imminent and serious threat to national security and is so declared by a joint resolution, adopted by a majority of the whole number of each House, which becomes law. Any increase in the internal revenue enacted under such a waiver shall be effective for not longer than two years."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. After 2 hours of debate on the joint resolution, it shall be in order to consider an amendment printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, if offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), or his designee, which shall be considered read and debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. SCARBOROUGH) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) each will control 1 hour of debate on the joint resolution.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SCARBOROUGH).

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS)

and ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to control the time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SCARBOROUGH) from the Committee on the Judiciary for yielding me the time, and I would like to move into general debate.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS).

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, today I stand before my colleagues to support this bill. I want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) for allowing me to speak on this measure and for introducing this piece of critical legislation and bringing it before this body today.

Mr. Speaker, America needs this tax limitation amendment. Why? Well, this year, millions of Americans, hardworking, tax-paying Americans will be plagued by "intaxication." What is intaxication? Well, if it were in the dictionary, intaxication would be defined by a euphoria experienced by getting a tax refund, well, a euphoria which lasts only until one realizes that it was one's money to start with.

This Congress has a duty to make it harder to raise taxes while ensuring a more responsible Federal budget. Why? Because we owe that type of accountability, we owe that responsibility to the hardworking American taxpayer when we take their money.

Let me give my colleagues a little history in my own State of Nevada. In 1994, I helped bring Nevada into the 21st Century with its own tax limitation amendment requiring a two-thirds supermajority vote. Why was that necessary? Because the left-wing liberal Democrats in the House in Nevada would not allow for an amendment to be passed, like they are doing here in this body. As a result, true democracy had to take its course.

I was required to go out and get 85,000 signatures from the people and citizens of the State of Nevada to bring that measure to a ballot where the citizens of Nevada could vote on it. The real democracy, Mr. Speaker, that bill, that legislation passed in Nevada by an overwhelming majority of the voters. In 1994, it received 78 percent of the vote. In 1996, it received 71 percent of the vote as an amendment to the Nevada Constitution, requiring a two-thirds supermajority to increase any State tax or fees.

The Federal Government needs to be put on the same fat-free diet that my home State of Nevada has been on since 1996. We need to make it more difficult to raise taxes on hardworking American men and women, and we need to shift congressional focus to the bloated spending programs of the Federal bureaucracy rather than paying

attention to the pockets of the American taxpayers.

Passage of this legislation would ensure that Congress focuses its efforts to balance the budget, cut wasteful spending, and not raise taxes to create unneeded Federal revenue.

Anyone who takes a close look at those States that have this same type of supermajority restriction on raising taxes will find that those States have experienced faster growing economies, a more rapid increase in employment, lower taxes, and reduced growth in government spending.

No additional financial burdens should be placed on America's working family without an overwhelming demonstration of need and support of their elected officials before they raise taxes.

Let us stop the intoxication of intoxication plaguing America today. I urge my colleagues to support this tax limitation amendment.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in the absence of anything constructive for the House to do, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

To begin, Mr. Speaker, let me congratulate the overwhelming majority of our colleagues, approximately 432 of them, for ignoring this exercise in partisan silliness.

No one believes that this is anything more than a very feeble effort from a party that is having difficulty in presenting a program to try and look like it is doing something. No one thinks this is going anywhere.

We are about to debate an amendment to the Constitution of the United States. Look who is here? At this point, it is now myself and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS). We are here because we have to be here. If one of us was not here, we would have to stop. So the barest minimum number of people possible to keep this farce going are impressed into it.

Frankly, I am a little resentful because we are having a serious hearing in judiciary on the antitrust measure that I cannot be at.

1100

I notice my Republican colleagues in the Judiciary, understanding this was coming, scripted it better; and they managed to get a Committee on Rules member to sit in so they could all be present at the hearing. The Committee on Rules presumably has nothing else to do at this time.

But now let us get to the proposal. I did hear one Member as I was coming in announced that what we are doing now is what James Madison would have done if he only were as smart as we are. It is true, and it is an inconvenient fact, because we do, as a body, like to pay tribute to the wisdom of the Founding Fathers; and what we are saying here is, boy, the Founding Fathers really blew one. Because this is not some obscure issue. They knew about taxation. They knew about two-thirds.

People make one of the least logical arguments I have ever heard, even in this sort of partisan silliness, when they say, well, the fact that the Constitution calls for two-thirds in some cases shows that it really should have called for two-thirds in this case. What that does is establish that the people who wrote the Constitution knew how to call for two-thirds when they thought the subject required it. They said, in certain cases, it takes two-thirds. They then, obviously, made a deliberate and conscious decision not to require two-thirds for taxation.

Now, to get around that, I did hear one of my colleagues say, well, if James Madison knew what we knew, he would have done what we have done. I doubt it. The evidence that James Madison would have thought exactly as he would have thought seems to me quite thin. What we have, of course, is the inconvenient fact that James Madison, quite clearly, thought the opposite. The people who wrote the Constitution decided that it would be a majority.

And that is, of course, a perfectly sensible thing. We happen to believe fundamentally that a majority of the people, as constituted, and remember the Senate is not that majoritarian, but a majority of those elected from the House on a popular basis and in the Senate on a State basis, make the important decisions. And all of the important ongoing governmental decisions are made by majorities.

Now, what has happened is this. The Republican Party used to be a very majoritarian party in its rhetoric. But they have now discovered, to their dismay, that the majority no longer loves them as much as they thought. This really goes back to 1995 when they shut down the Government and were jeered instead of cheered. So what we now have is an announcement by the Republican party that we cannot trust the majority of the American people, as the Constitution says they should be represented; and for measures they do not like, they need two-thirds.

Now, it is also the case that the Republican Party is offering a procedural objection to taxes instead of a substantive one. For example, the last time we raised taxes, as I recall, was 1993. We did do some tax increases before that under Ronald Reagan and George Bush, but the last time we raised them was in 1993, in the first year of the Clinton administration. And I remember my Republican colleagues objecting because we were raising taxes on middle-income people.

Now, most of the tax increases went there on people making well upwards of \$100,000 in 1993, not middle income even by Republican standards; but there was an increase in the gasoline tax and they pointed that out. Well, we recently had a spike in gasoline prices because of OPEC, and I think a failure on the part of the administration to act initially as promptly as they should have, although I think they

since have taken some effective action, so one suggestion was let us now deal with that 4.3 cent increase in the gas tax.

The Republican Party had a chance to do that. Where is the bill? The Republican Party, having fulminated against the gasoline tax increase of 1993 had the ideal opportunity to come forward with a reduction in the gasoline tax, and a few of them talked about it. Where is the bill? We did get a resolution threatening OPEC that we might call them names if they did not do some things. I have not seen a bill to reduce that gasoline tax.

The last time we raised taxes was in 1993. They will talk about how terrible it was, but they will not do anything about it. And the reason is that reality has had a very severe impact on the Republican Party and on their ideology. On the one hand, they denounce government; on the other hand, they seek opportunities to increase it.

Now, of course, we have the military budget, the single largest part of the discretionary budget; and it is faith among the Republicans that that is too small. We need vast increases, billions and billions of dollars to increase the military budget. But that is not all. The Republican Party has gone from denouncing the notion of helping older people buy prescription drugs to embracing it. They say there are differences in how much, but they want a new program. The Republican Party is for a new program, which will cost government money.

A couple of weeks ago we took a step that I approved of and that many Republicans approved of, and we put the Federal Government for the first time into the business of helping local fire departments in a systematic way. I am glad to do that, but it costs government money.

My Republican governor was just down here yesterday acknowledging the fact that a major highway project that he and his Republican predecessor thought were very important to Massachusetts would cost a couple of billion dollars more than they thought. That will cost government money.

For much of the time, my Republican colleagues join many Democratic colleagues in talking about increasing the budget of the National Institute of Health, increasing money for transportation, increasing money for the military, buying prescription drugs. We passed a housing bill last week overwhelmingly which talked about how important various Federal housing programs are to help people get homeownership. These cost money.

So in the abstract the Republican Party wants to look like the antitax party. But in particular they want to spend government money, just as many of the rest of us do, for good purposes. So what we get, to resolve that contradiction, is an entirely silly effort. I should not say it is an effort, because no one takes it seriously. We get this gesture to amend the Constitution of

the United States and to wrench it away from democracy.

Now, this is not the first time the Republican Party has shown its lack of faith in the voters. We had that previously with term limits. What they said was, those voters, they do not understand. They cannot deal with elections. We have to put term limits on because they cannot understand it. Of course, for many Republicans the idea of term limits in the abstract was far more attractive than the idea of term limits in the particular, because among the people who will be voting for this constitutional amendment today to limit the electorate's ability to call for a tax increase will be people who will be defying their own pledge to limit the electorate's ability to reelect them. They have decided that does not work.

So we have what is, finally, fundamentally, a notion that democracy is flawed; that in this country the compromises they made about majority rule for the Senate, for instance two Senators per State, that was not enough; that we have to go further and make a very drastic change in the basic structure of government and say that when it comes to deciding how much money should be spent for public purposes and how much for private purposes, majority rule does not work.

Now, one last point. We hear this remarkably foolish notion that there is a dispute between the money that goes to the Government and the money that goes to the people. But all the money belongs to the people. The people understand, and the Republican Party has been forced to acknowledge it, that there are some purposes very important to the people that they cannot accomplish unless they do them jointly.

A tax cut putting money in individuals' pockets does not expand airports. A tax cut putting money in individuals' pockets will not solve the problem of putting more police on the streets or aiding local fire departments or increasing medical research through NIH. That is, there are, in a civilized society, some very important purposes that can best be accomplished by individuals spending their own money personally, and that is what the market generates, and that is a good thing; but there are also important purposes, particularly in a complex urban society, that can only be done jointly. And that is why we come together through government to deal with the environment, to deal with public safety, to deal with elderly people and other people's children who will not themselves be able to make it.

What this is is an announcement that democracy does not work; that the fundamental scheme of government adopted in 1787 in the Constitution is flawed; and, therefore, it has to be changed.

Fortunately, as the dearth of Members in this Chamber shows, no one takes it seriously. It is a political gesture put forward by a party that has no substantive legislative agenda. And I

guess, given that, this is as good a way to kill time as any.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I do appreciate, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts pointing out, in his view, how this is just wasting time and it is the majority party that has nothing better to do. I want the gentleman to know that that is an argument that we hear over and over and over and have heard this over and over and over. This is what we would be led to believe about a balanced budget; whether we would have a balanced budget or not. The other side simply said there is no need for a balanced budget. America is great. Things are headed in the right direction.

Well, it was the Republican Party that brought forth not only the ideas but had the conviction to make sure that we would continue to talk about a balanced budget, even when there were people who believed it would never, ever happen.

I recall Senator FRITZ HOLLINGS, who is a marvelous Senator in the other body, stated that if we ever had a balanced budget by the year 2002, he would take a high dive off the top of the capitol. A high dive. It will never happen. There will never, ever be a balanced budget. That is what we were told on the other side.

We were told about welfare reform that welfare reform should never happen because welfare reform would put millions of people out in the streets and babies and families sleeping on sidewalks. Well, lo and behold, we had welfare reform, and we had welfare reform Republican-style that is so successful that even President Clinton calls it his own package today. Welfare reform that has led to not only changing behavior of people who had been on welfare for generation after generation, but welfare reform that has led to a 47 percent reduction in the amount of people who have had their hands out.

Instead, we have found jobs available because the Republican Party had the presence of mind to fight those who said we would never have a balanced budget; we would never have an economy where we could employ all the people who were on welfare.

And about IRS reform, they said, oh, there is nothing wrong with the IRS. The Tax Code is great. We love that. That is the Democrat Party mantra: no problem with America. We need to keep it the exact same way that we have got it today.

Well, it was a few voices in the Republican Party, who are still alive and well today, and with more than enough votes to pass these bills, with more than enough votes to talk about our vision for America, that want to make it more difficult to raise taxes in America.

Oh, my colleagues may say, the Constitution should address this. Well, we did not even have any tax bills; we

could not even tax until the 16th amendment, until 1913. What happened in 1913, when we began taxing in America? The IRS looks entirely different than it does today.

Why today do we need this? We need this two-thirds tax limitation because we need to make it more difficult to raise taxes. We, today in America, are at a precious time in our history. The precious time is that the Republican Party has made it possible as a result of the balanced budget, when the other side said no and it was a silly idea, the other side said welfare reform is a silly idea and we should never have it, the IRS Tax Code reform the other side said was a silly idea and that we should not do it. That is what has unleashed the power of the American energy.

And it is called the free market system; men and women who go to work every day, who are making America work; and yet even today, when we have a surplus, our President has proposed a \$96 billion tax increase in the year 2000. That is why we need to make sure that it requires two-thirds of this body and two-thirds of the Senate to say, yes, President Clinton and Vice President GORE, we want your ideas, we want to raise taxes by \$96 billion.

Well, I am sure we will hear it said over and over about what a great plan the President's budget is; that President Clinton has the best budget, great for everybody; yet not one Member of this body would even sponsor the President's plan. Not one person would sponsor the President's budget. There is a reason why. There is a reason why today we are on the floor of the House of Representatives to say that we need to make it harder to raise taxes in America.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KLECZKA) be allowed to control the time on this side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The balance of the time on the minority side will be controlled by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KLECZKA).

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT).

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I support the bill, and thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I associate myself with his remarks because he is right on target.

I want to put a few things down on the RECORD. In 1899, the Director of the Patent Office said "Everything that can be invented has been invented."

1115

In 1905, President Cleveland said, "Sensible and responsible women do not want to vote in America."

Lord Kelvin, President of the Royal Society of England, said, "Heavier

than air flying machines are impossible."

In 1927, Harry M. Warner, Chief of Warner Brothers Studios, said, "Who the hell wants to hear actors talk?"

In 1968, an engineer at IBM said, "As far as computer systems are concerned, what practical use will they really have?"

In 1977, the chairman of Digital Equipment Corporation said, "There's no reason for anyone to ever want to have a computer in their home."

In 1987, the Western Union internal memo said, "The telephone has just too many shortcomings. Don't give up on our system."

Edwin Drake said, "People are literally going to drill in the earth to try and find oil?"

The big one was Dr. Lee DeForest. He said, "Man will never reach the moon. Never."

My colleagues, about the only thing I can say in my short speech is this: I tried to change the burden of proof in a civil tax case and required judicial consent before seizure; and I could not get it done for 10 years, the Democrats would not hold a hearing.

I want to thank the Republicans for not only holding the hearings, I want to give my colleagues the facts. In 1998 was the IRS reform law. In 1997, the last year, the old law. In 1999, the first year, the new law.

Now we compare them. In 1997, there were 3.1 million attachment of wages and bank accounts. In 1999, 540,000. Property liens in 1997, 680,000. The new law, 1999, 168,000.

But listen to this. The American people should be listening carefully. Requiring judicial consent before the IRS could take their home or their farm or their business, that the Republicans put my language in, in 1997, 10,037 Americans lost their homes, farms, and businesses. In 1999, 161. From 10,000 from the back room to 161 when the burden of proof was on the Government and had to have judicial consent.

Do I support this bill? Does a bear sleep in the woods?

I think we should mandate a two-thirds requirement before we continue to gouge and raise the American people's taxes, to boot, let an agency become so powerful an IRS employee would not testify unless she was behind a screen so we could not see her, with a voice scrambler so we could not identify her voice, and a guarantee her family would not be hurt.

God almighty.

Finally, let me say this: I think our Tax Code should be thrown out with a flat 15 percent, true 15 percent national retail sales tax. I will be testifying on the Tauzin/Trafficant bill at 1 o'clock myself. It will ultimately be the tax scheme in America.

I think the Democrats, although they do not want to hear this, should get on board because they are getting moved further and further out of the picture, they are not being very progressive.

So I want to thank the chairman for the time. I believe his comments are

right on target. I want to thank the Republican party for putting the Trafficant burden of proof language in the reform bill and the judicial consent language in the reform bill, and I want to thank him on behalf of all Americans whose homes, farms, and businesses were not stolen.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 6 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to Joint Resolution 94. I will attempt to make my points with logic rather than volume.

This is the fifth time the House has taken up this particular constitutional amendment. It seems that since the Republicans have taken over control of the House, we have had over 100 constitutional amendments introduced.

When we are sworn in every 2 years in January, we swear to uphold the Constitution and nowhere do we say we come here to rewrite the Constitution.

Let us look back and see why the Framing Fathers put into the Constitution only three instances where a two-thirds vote would be necessary to take any action in the Government.

One was to change the Constitution. They thought it was a very, very important, sacred document and much thought should go into changing the various articles of the Constitution and, if we intend to do that, let us do it by a two-thirds vote.

They also provided that, if we were going to expel a Member from the House, one who was elected by a majority, I should add, of the people from his or her district, that should be done by a two-thirds vote.

The last and only other instance where they provided for a two-thirds vote was overriding a presidential veto. And here again, the bill that got to the President got there by a majority vote of both houses; and if, in fact, we are going to disagree with the President's objections, that we should do it by more than a majority. And so the Framers indicated at that point, let us call for a two-thirds vote. Only those three instances.

James Madison wisely observed in the Federalist Papers, supermajorities would reverse the fundamental principle of a free government. And he said, "It would no longer be the majority that would rule. The power would be transferred to the minority." Let me repeat that. "It would no longer be the majority that would rule. The power would be transferred to the minority." And how correct he is.

For almost all actions in this House a majority vote is required. A majority vote is required to give tax breaks at times to those large and very vocal corporate citizens who do not deserve them. Those tax breaks, my colleagues, if this were to pass and become part of the Constitution, would only require that a minority could stop closing that loophole. And the reason why is because, under that situation, to close a tax loophole of, let us say, a foreign corporation operating here but trans-

ferring the profits to a foreign land to avoid taxation, if we were to close that loophole, it would take two-thirds. More importantly, it would take a minority to stop it.

That is what this is all about, my colleagues. This is not to prevent willy-nilly tax increases to be placed upon the American people. Know full well that all of us in this Chamber and the Senate take that very seriously and it is done at times when it needs to be done. And if it is done without need and necessity, every 2 years we face the electorate and they will let their views be known.

But for the Republicans to once again try to tamper with the Constitution to provide a two-thirds vote for changing the tax laws in this country and not to provide that same two-thirds vote to close loopholes, which has the effect of bringing in more revenue, loopholes which are unwarranted, which happen all too often in this House, for that they could stop it with a small minority.

This constitutional amendment is not wise. It should not be supported by the House. If the taxpayers object to any tax action by the Committee on Ways and Means that I serve on or action by the full House, they will let their views be known. Let no one be kidded about that.

The gentleman who is controlling time on the other side indicated the great things we did with the welfare reform. But I should point out to him and to the other Members in the Chamber, if there are any, which there are not, that that was done with a majority vote. And if, in fact, that was so important, why do they not provide for a two-thirds vote for actions of the House dealing with issues like welfare reform? I would say that would be ridiculous. Because the stated principle of this country is majority rules.

In the House Rules, when the Republicans took over in 1994, they provided a supermajority, 60 percent, to pass any tax increases. That is in the House Rules today, the rules that govern our activity in this Chamber. And every time that has come before the House, every time legislation has come before the House to raise taxes, and we have had it in H.R. 2491 in 1996, in H.R. 2425 that same year, we have had it again in 1996 in H.R. 3103, every time those increases came before us, the Republicans waived the House Rules.

By waiving the House Rules, they cast them aside. We do not look at them for that action. So consistency is not one of the Republican virtues evidently. But, nevertheless, this constitutional amendment is ill advised and it should not be supported by the Members of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I really do appreciate the minority pointing out all the wonderful things that my party has done: a

balanced budget, welfare reform, IRS Tax Code reform. These were not tax increases that required a super-majority. They were tax decreases and things that would increase not only the efficiency of America but bring more freedom for people.

I also would like to thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT), a Democrat, for his bipartisan effort to ensure that not only the people of Ohio but the people of this country understand that this is not a Republican or Democrat issue, this is a simple matter: Do we want to make it more difficult to raise taxes on American citizens? Do we want to make it more difficult for America to have to pay more taxes? Do we want to raise the bar to a level that would say this is not about willy-nilly tax increases, this is about something serious because it comes right out of their pocket?

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the honorable gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER).

Mr. VITTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise before the House today to urge my colleagues to support this tax limitation amendment, an important joint resolution that will help rein in creeping big government.

To listen to the minority, we would think this is some radical idea that is just from outer space. The fact of the matter is, this is a good idea that has come to us from States around the country, as so many of our good ideas and reforms that we have been trying to implement at the Federal level do. It is not a radical idea. It is an idea in practice in many States across the country, including my State of Louisiana.

States, particularly in recent years, have approved all sorts of restrictions on the ability of their legislatures to raise taxes. Voters in these States have agreed with this overwhelmingly. They have responded with overwhelming margins in terms of passing constitutional amendments to heighten the bar, to raise the bar, to limit State legislatures in terms of their ability to raise taxes, make it harder for State legislatures and local governments to increase taxes.

The tax limitation amendment on the floor today embodies these principles and this common practice in many States. I said it is in practice in Louisiana. It has been for some time. We require a two-thirds vote of the legislature to raise taxes. That is not a new idea. It has been in practice for many years.

When I was in the State legislature over the past 7 years, we went a step further and we adopted the same rule to even raise what can fairly be categorized as fees. So we put the same two-thirds vote burden even in terms of raising what could be fairly called a fee versus a tax. And again, this is not a radical idea. It has been in practice, and it has worked.

Now, some on the minority side would say, well, this is unfair because

it tilts the playing field, it favors tax decreases, which would require a simple majority, and disfavors tax increases, which would now require two-thirds majority.

Let me be very direct about that point. You bet it does. That is why I am for the proposal. This is a good, solid reason behind the proposal, in fact, to tilt the playing field because we have an unacceptably high level of taxation in this country. What this vote will largely be about is our level of taxation, the highest in peacetime ever. Is that reasonable? Should we rush to increase it? Or is it reasonable to say that should be the limit, and we should try to go down from here?

1130

So when Democrats take to the floor and say we are creating a bias against new taxes, we are creating a bias for tax cuts, I say amen, yes, we are. That is a large reason I am for this proposal, and I think it is very interesting and instructive that that is the reason many Democrats will oppose it, and that is the reason many Republicans, certainly including me, will speak for and vote for the proposal.

We also have to recognize that this is not being done in a vacuum. This is not being done in some era of historically low taxes. It is being done in a very specific context, an era of the highest peacetime tax burden on American working families in history. That is something we need to face and work toward reversing, the highest tax burden peacetime on American working families. In that context, is it not fair to say we are going to put this two-thirds vote into effect to not raise taxes?

Finally, one of the most important things this tax limitation amendment will do is to help bring this body together, to help bring the American people together and achieve solid consensus on a very important question of raising taxes. All too often very important measures like tax increases are passed by the slimmest of majorities. That really fractionalizes our House and the American people in the national debate over these questions. Should something as significant as increasing a historically high tax burden even further not require a solid consensus? Should that not require a supermajority? Will that not be good for our national debate and our body politic? I think a two-thirds majority should be required, I think that would be good for this institution and for the body politic and for the debate around the country so that we only do that when we have a solid consensus in favor of it.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The real reason we are here today debating this issue is that this is an election year and we need a rollcall. We need a rollcall on who supports increasing taxes with a two-thirds vote. To prove my point, I ask the Speaker to look around the Chamber. Here the

House is involved in doing one of the more important, if not the most important, functions that we were elected to do; and the interest level is so high, no one bothered to come. Of the hundred or so authors of this amendment, they are not lined up to come and defend it. They know as well as you know, as well as I know, this is for show.

Like the swallows coming back to Capistrano, this constitutional amendment is here because it is an election year. I ask my friends, where is the constitutional amendment to provide a two-thirds vote to decrease Social Security benefits that millions of Americans depend on? Where is the constitutional amendment to require a two-thirds vote to cut Medicare? Where is your constitutional amendment to provide a two-thirds vote to cut education funding for our kids? That is not here, and it ain't coming here because that we can do by a majority vote. But we need two-thirds to lock in tax loopholes for some people's corporate friends. That is what this is all about.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT).

(Mr. McDERMOTT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I listened to my good friend from Wisconsin, and he is wrong. They have not just done it in election years. They have brought this thing out here every year at this time. This is an annual event. It really is like the sparrows, or swallows. Is it swallows or sparrows?

Mr. KLECZKA. Swallows.

Mr. McDERMOTT. We have got to take this seriously, do we not? These guys really worry about somehow the money getting away from us, that it is somehow flowing out. They have been in control for 5 years. When they came in, they passed a House rule that said that if you are going to do anything with taxes, it took a two-thirds vote, a three-fifths vote or whatever it was.

It did not make any difference, because every time it came up, they waived the rule. They waived their own rule. They said it is going to take this much to pass any tax increase. But whenever they wanted to do it, they waived the rule and said we will do it with a majority. They did it so many times in the first session, the first 2 years they were in power, that the next time they came in, they said, well, let us revise the rule and make it really meaningless so that it only affects two or three little parts of the code. That way we can put any tax increase we want over here by a majority rule and in all the rest of the Tax Code. We protected these couple over here.

They could not even comply with that in a bill that the President vetoed last year. This is not a serious event. As I said yesterday, what you really need to do is figure out looking at the calendar what holy day is it or what saint's day is it or what holiday is it or what important day is it for Americans

and you will figure out what the Republicans are going to bring out on the floor.

When it was St. Valentine's Day, we brought out the valentine for everybody, the marriage tax penalty bill passed here; and everybody got a valentine from the House of Representatives. It has not passed the Senate. It is probably going to pass maybe sometime in the future, but nothing has happened to it since. We have not heard a word about it.

Now we are down to tax day. We get a rash of bills yesterday, the taxpayers' bill of rights, and now we have got this thing out here for a supermajority on raising taxes, because they know people are thinking about filling out their income tax, all of us are doing it; and they know that people are worried or think they are paying too much or whatever, so let us go out there with something that will stir the people up, and we will show them we really care about taxes. But when it gets dark around here and they have to do something, they immediately waive all the rules and slide through stuff all the time.

Now, the thing that I keep wondering about, I was looking at my calendar last night trying to figure out what day are they going to bring the Patients' Bill of Rights out here. You have got all the people in this country, all the polls show they want something that passed the House, passed the Senate, been sitting in a conference committee, they want something that puts the control of their health care back in their doctors' and their own hands, not the insurance companies.

Any poll you run out there will be 80 percent for doing something about the Patients' Bill of Rights bill. But I cannot figure out what day it is going to be. I thought maybe Fourth of July; that would be freedom from insurance companies. I do not know how they are going to construct this, but they will find a day that that fits. The next question I have is what day are they going to bring out the prescription drug bill for seniors? There must be some day. It would not be Labor Day, I guess. Memorial Day maybe. That is it, Memorial Day. They will come out with it because they will think people want to memorialize old people. I do not know how they are going to do it.

If you would not waste so much time on this kind of nonsense and would come out here and deal with the issues that really affect American people, you would be able to get somewhere. But this kind of thing, we will take the vote. As I look around the floor, there are four of us on the floor right now, out of 435. It is a big issue, folks. You can tell how much people really care about this. One hundred of them sign it and they will not even come over and talk about it. I guess they are kind of ashamed of the foolishness of it.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDERMOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, we have a sad situation in this country where American citizens are renouncing their citizenship, taking their wealth to foreign countries in a very, very obvious attempt to avoid any taxation. If, in fact, this constitutional amendment would prevail and be ratified by the States, what would the effect be on American citizens renouncing their citizenship and us trying to stop that outflow for tax avoidance?

Mr. McDERMOTT. We would have to have a two-thirds vote in here to get anything done. We could not do it by the majority vote. A minority of people, 33 percent of the people in this House could stop that from happening. We could never correct that. The gentleman just points out one of a million problems with this. But it is obviously not a serious effort. It is going to go down here very shortly because most people realize that it is just for show. And when the day comes, I believe it will be about the 7th of November, you will wish you spent your time on the floor working on the Patients' Bill of Rights and prescription drugs and financing for schools and a whole raft of other real issues.

This is not a real issue. If it were, you would not waive your own rule every time you bring an appropriations act out here. You have broken every single point of order on putting caps on expenditures. Every single one has waived the caps. The ability to constrain spending is in your own hearts; and now you want to come out here and say, well, this is what we do. The Bible says, by your deeds you shall know them. And, in fact, your deeds say this is nonsense. Everyone ought to vote against this.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Never has there been a more logical explanation to understand the differences between the two parties. The Democrats today in the minority stand up and say things that take time, ideas that take time to mature are bad ideas, like raising the earning limits for seniors that took 30 years before we could get that done. A balanced budget, 30 years of Democrat control to where we had \$5.5 trillion worth of debt in this country. Welfare reform. Bad ideas. These are the same words we hear over and over and over again. IRS Tax Code reform. Silly. Who would want that? I am pleased to say that the Republican Party wants it. I am pleased to say that people back home want it. I am pleased to say that today what we are doing is very important for people who understand that it is too easy for Congress to raise taxes. I am proud of what we are doing. It may take us 20 more years; it may take us 5 more years. But I will tell you that it is the right thing to do.

The speaker before talked about people leaving this country, leaving this country because they do not want to pay taxes. That could be true. I think it is that they realize they have got to

pay too much in taxes. The things that they had worked hard for all their life, that they then could sit back and enjoy life is being taken from them by a tax code, an unfair tax code, the threat of a Congress raising taxes to take more and more from people who had earned the money.

That is why people are leaving. They are not leaving because it would be more difficult to raise taxes. They are not leaving because they are concerned about somebody taking less of their money. They are concerned about someone coming and taking from them what they have worked hard for.

1145

This is an important issue. This is a defining issue in Washington, D.C.

Mr. Speaker, I am very, very proud and pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Farmsville, North Carolina (Mr. JONES), a member of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas, and also I rise in strong support of this tax limitation amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I am like most of my colleagues, both Republican and Democrat; when I go back to my district, I do a lot of speaking at civic clubs, I hold town meetings, and probably the most important thing that I can say is that, like all of my colleagues on both sides of the fence, I listen to the people I have the privilege to serve.

I can tell you that in the Third District of North Carolina, and I believe throughout this country, the majority of the people that pay taxes believe that they are overburdened with a tax system and with taxes coming from Washington, D.C.; and many of these people throughout this country and throughout my district feel that too many times those in Washington, D.C. on both sides of the aisle really are not listening to them.

I think that when we are today debating this issue, I am like the gentleman from the other side, I wish there were more people on the floor, and maybe during the day there will be others on both sides of this issue coming to the floor, but I think today what we are saying to the American people is that we are listening to you.

As the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) said, yes, maybe it will take 2 or 3 more years, but the point is, yes, you are right to talk about Social Security and these other issues, we do need to be debating these issues and need to try to find solutions to problems. But I will tell you that one of the problems is that the American people are overburdened with taxation.

I have to say, being a former Democrat who became a Republican, that I believe sincerely that it has been my party that has started these debates on the floor. It has been my party that has introduced legislation, and sometimes in a bipartisan way that we have passed legislation, to bring tax relief to the American people.

I think today this is a unique opportunity to talk about this tax limitation act because, Mr. Speaker, when we talk about amending the Constitution and creating a two-thirds majority to pass tax increases on the American people, we are basically giving it back to the American people through their legislative process to say yes, we want an amendment that will protect us and protect our families.

Mr. Speaker, the four largest Federal tax increases in the last 20 years would have failed had this amendment been in place. I think that is worthy to be repeated.

The four largest Federal tax increases in the last 20 years would have failed had this amendment been in place.

Mr. Speaker, most recently, in 1993, President Clinton and a Democratic Congress passed the largest tax increase in America's history. Now, I do not know if that would have passed or not, I doubt if it would have, if this had been in place.

Mr. Speaker, we always are saying, both sides of the aisle, that this is the people's House, that we are the people's representatives. Well, I think we need to listen to the people, and the people in this country are crying out for relief. They do feel and I feel also that they are overburdened.

I think the citizens of this country have a right to know when the House is debating a tax increase and that we need to debate it on the floor of the House, and I think a two-thirds majority of both sides voting to bring relief for passing a tax increase on the American people is extremely important.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, Congress should never seek to raise taxes on the American people without a two-thirds majority. That, again, is my philosophy. Some will agree, some will disagree.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I want to read a quote from former President Ronald Reagan from his 1985, I believe, State of the Union address. I am going to repeat it after I read it one time.

Mr. Reagan said, "Every dollar the Federal Government does not take from us," meaning the American people, "every decision it does not make for us," meaning the American people, "will make our economy stronger, our lives more abundant, our future more free."

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely believe that those words by Mr. Reagan fully explain why and how so many people throughout this country feel that too many times the United States Congress is not listening to them, no matter what the issue might be, whether it is taxes or another issue. But when it comes to taxes, Mr. Speaker, I can honestly say it is the Republican Party that has brought these debates on the floor to bring relief to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I want to quote Mr. Reagan again. I am going to quote Mr. Reagan when he said, "Every dollar the

Federal Government does not take from us," us, the American people, "every decision it does not make for us," the American people, "will make our economy stronger, our lives more abundant, our future more free."

Mr. Speaker, if we are truly the people's House and the people's representatives, then we need to pass this amendment.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in the interest of historical accuracy, I was going to ask if President Reagan said that when he signed a big tax increase in 1982, which he deemed necessary for economic purposes, or when a couple of years later he signed another significant tax increase which raised Social Security taxes? Those were two tax increases President Reagan signed. I do not think either one of them got two-thirds, so they might not have been passed under this. I wonder whether Mr. Reagan said that when he was signing those two very significant tax increases. I voted against both of them, by the way.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I should point out that the framers of the Constitution provided that Congress shall have the sole power to declare war, and under that constitutional provision a majority, a majority, of both Houses is required. If, in fact, there was a need to amend the Constitution to provide for a two-thirds vote, surely do not you think a declaration of war, and not taxes, should be the item that we would be debating today? Do you think a declaration of war is less important than the tax issue of this country? I think not.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 9 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the American people have come to realize that every spring about this time, as sure as daylight savings time going into effect and Easter and Passover coming along and kids anticipating their graduation from school, that it is tax time on April 15, and what they can expect is the same old complicated Tax Code. But they can be reassured that Republicans will be out here talking about it.

All those American citizens that are out there now working on their tax returns may not find a great deal of reassurance that after 6 years in office, all that our Republican colleagues, after 6 years of holding control in this House, all that our Republican colleagues have to offer this morning is the same old recycled speeches they have been giving and the same approach for the last 6 years.

I remember in one of the earlier sessions, I think it was back around 1995 or 1996, some fellow came out here and brought the whole Tax Code. I think if

he had piled that thing end to end it would have reached up there to the clock.

Well, what have the Republicans done for the ordinary taxpayer that is out there struggling through their returns to simplify that code? Well, today, after 6 years of Republican leadership in this House, it probably now stretches above the clock, because they have added an additional 100 sections more or less to the Tax Code. Instead of dealing with issues like simplifying our Tax Code and making it fairer and more equitable to the ordinary middle-class taxpayer, they have recycled whatever speech and proposal they considered at their last political convention. So this is the second, third, maybe more years in Congress that we have had this same sorry proposal out here to consider.

Now, if you are out there working on your return and you are happy, and you think that a Tax Code that stretches up to the clock and beyond under Republican leadership is great, that it is fair, that it is equitable, that everyone in our country, from the very largest corporations to the person who is down at the lower end of the wage scale that is figuring out a fairly simple tax return, if you think they are all being treated fairly; if you think there are no special interests that come to Washington and get special loopholes written into the Tax Code so that they can dodge taxes, so that they can come close to cheating on their taxes under the system; if you like every aspect of the system that we have now, plus the additional 100 sections that the Republicans have added to the Tax Code, today's proposal is a perfect proposal for you. Because what they are seeking to do with this old recycled, retread proposal that they drag out on the eve of tax-paying day every season, what they are seeking to do is to freeze into place the code that we have today. So if some lobbyist has come to Washington and they have written themselves in a special loophole for their special interests because they had the longest limousine and the biggest political action committee and the most effective lobbyist, well, their provision will be frozen in unless we can get not only a majority of this Congress, but two-thirds of this Congress to come forward and stand up to the special interest group, which we could not get a majority to do in the past, but we have now got to have two-thirds.

So if you like the system we have now, if you like all the loopholes and the special interest provisions, you ought to be supporting this proposal. It will freeze them in forever if this retread proposal were actually designed and put into place in our Constitution.

If you think we need significant change in the way our system works, well, then I would think you would be strongly opposed to this kind of approach.

Now, over the course of the last 6 years we have often heard the same

people who came out and piled up the Tax Code tell us that they disliked it so much that they were going to just grab down there and pull it out by the roots. That is a good applause line at the kind of convention that considers these old retreat proposals like we have up here this morning.

Well, they have been in office 6 years, and they had a hearing on pulling the code out by the roots back in 1995. As I speak, there is another hearing going on. There has been no proposal advanced for a vote over that 6 years in the Committee on Ways and Means to pull it out by the roots. There has been no proposal presented even this week after 6 years of the Republicans being in charge here in the House. I think they cannot figure out which root to pull out, where and what new roots to put down to replace it.

So, instead, they keep coming up with the same old retreat proposals, that if we ever made the mistake of actually adopting them, would only make the system worse than it is today and would assure that we could not get change in the system.

Mr. Speaker, there are some specific proposals that some of us have been advancing to try to address inequities in this Tax Code. What has been most I think indicative of the kind of problem we have today is that Republican leadership would rather focus on these meaningless retreats, instead of focusing on real issues, such as the way that corporate tax shelters manage to avoid what many have estimated is \$10 billion a year in taxes and closing that up and seeing that they get treated the way that middle-class taxpayers get treated. The Republican leadership has said there is no need to address corporate tax shelters.

The situation is so bad that it has made the front page of *Forbes* magazine. This is not some strange off-beat journal. This is the magazine that calls itself "the capitalist's tool." They wrote about the problem of tax shelter hustlers, describing on the magazine cover this fellow in the fedora, "respectable accountants are peddling dicey corporate tax loopholes." Ten billion dollars a year is the estimate of lost tax revenues from tax shelters.

And the response of the Republican leadership, when they could be out here today doing something about that, is to squelch any real reform. The chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means and the Republican majority leader are saying that tax avoidance is about as American as apple pie, and encourage the continuation of this kind of misconduct.

The Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Lawrence Summers, has suggested that this is the most serious compliance problem that we have in America today, this problem of tax hustlers. It is usually some former employee here on Capitol Hill that goes out to work for some big accounting firm, and they make a fortune selling and teaching people how to dodge, cheat, join in on tax scams.

And I think it is an outrage. I think it is the kind of outrage that has grown to such a substantial extent that we now even have the lawyers that represent some of the corporations that are dodging their taxes coming before the Congress in the form of the American Bar Association tax section, the tax section of the New York State bar, and urging us to do something. They recognize what a do-nothing Congress this is and how it will not respond, and they come forward and say "please address this problem." But this Republican leadership has retreads like this instead.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOGGETT. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I have a question. I am on the Committee on Ways and Means with the gentleman, and I do not remember us ever having a hearing on this.

1200

I do not remember us ever having a hearing, have us ever come and testify about this. To the best of my knowledge, there has never been a hearing in the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DOGGETT. On this particular amendment?

Mr. McDERMOTT. Yes, on this particular amendment.

Mr. DOGGETT. They had a hearing at their political convention on it, so they really do not need to have substantive hearings on it, because this is a political gimmick. It is a gimmick, not really a serious proposal about how to resolve the concerns American taxpayers have.

Mr. McDERMOTT. So when they put the sham together, they do not even bother putting the dressing around it and having a hearing?

Mr. DOGGETT. I think that is right. In other words, most proposals dealing with the Tax Code would bring in the experts; would do the kind of thing that I sought to do with these tax shelter hustlers, bring in the academic experts, the people out in the field, as well as just some ordinary citizens from across the country, to point out what an outrage this is.

But on this proposal, this has been more of a political gamesmanship kind of thing. They have not had a hearing because I guess other than recycling this old political rhetoric, there really would not be much to hear.

Mr. McDERMOTT. That is why we call it a retreat. It has been through here, and they are trying to do it again. I think we will see it next year.

Mr. DOGGETT. Next year we will have substantial change. I believe that next year, since this particular Congress once again will not even honor the recommendations of its Joint Tax Committee to address corporate tax shelters, ignores the recommendations of the Secretary of the Treasury that this is the biggest tax compliance problem we have in America today, ignores

the estimates that \$10 billion a year is being lost in these cheating tax dodge schemes, I believe the next Congress is going to have enough new Members that people will say, enough is enough. We have had 6 years of do nothing, do little, avoidance of these problems.

Just as these kinds of folks encourage tax avoidance, we have had a leadership that has problem avoidance. They want to avoid the problems. I know it appeals to the same special interests that get these tax shelter hustler proposals.

But I believe the American people that are out there working on their taxes, certainly everybody would like to pay less, but they would like to at least be sure that other people are being dealt with fairly. Clearly these people are not dealing fairly.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, here we continue with the wonderful debate, which is what this amendment is all about, an opportunity for us to debate in the open, on the floor of the House of Representatives, the question of whether we are going to make it more difficult for Congress to raise taxes, raise taxes on the American taxpayer or not. It is a question of whether Washington, D.C. is going to make it more difficult to raise taxes or whether we are going to keep the status quo.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle once again talk about all the things that this Republican Congress has not done, all the things that we have had an opportunity to do. I would remind my colleagues that, in fact, these same words were said about a balanced budget.

I remember running for Congress back in 1994, and people were saying to me over and over and over again, We will never have a balanced budget. It will never happen in my lifetime.

Well, there were people who did believe it. The naysayers who were there today are people who understand that this economy that we have in America, the opportunity, the growing economic development that we have, jobs in communities, schools that are producing not only brighter and better students but students who have technology at their fingertips, this is a part of what happens when we have a grand and bold idea, an idea that has always on the other side been talked about in negative ways: It would never happen. A balanced budget is silly. No need to do that.

Welfare reform, the same way. We talked about welfare reform on the floor of this House of Representatives, and day after day after day it was the other side, it was the minority party, who said, we do not need welfare reform. It will not amount to anything. As a matter of fact, it will harm the children of America.

IRS Tax Code reform. We hear the gentleman from Texas say that the Republicans have done nothing with what they had. In fact, what we have done is

done things that are for the taxpayer: A \$500 per child tax credit, a \$500 per child tax credit that matters. Every single time an American who has a child goes to fill out their tax form, they get a \$500 per child tax credit. It is going to happen again this Saturday as Americans are filling out their forms, they will get that.

Cutting capital gains. We heard, Cutting capital gains? A dangerous, risky proposition. We should not do that. Mr. Speaker, I would submit that the 1997 capital gains tax cut that Republicans voted on and supported that was signed by the President has meant that America has a booming economy.

Oh, the minority said, do Members realize that the tax collector, the United States government, will have \$9 billion less in their coffers? Well, once again the minority party is concerned about the tax collector. It was the Republican party who was concerned about the taxpayer.

What happened? What happened was that the tax collector got \$90 billion additional dollars in the Treasury, just like Republicans, through the leadership of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER), chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, said that we will make a substantial investment in America because we are going to lower the risk. We are going to encourage people to participate in that which we are doing. We are going to take people and move them from welfare to work. We are going to enrich communities because we are going to allow dollars to be invested in America.

Oh, but there is more. This Republican do-nothing Congress raised the exemption for death taxes. That is not do-nothing, that is a realistic opportunity for people upon their death to know that their estate, instead of being broken up and splintered to the wind, thrown to the wind, and family businesses, small businesses and land, agricultural producers of food for not only this country but the world being broken up just because of a Tax Code, we heard, Oh, no, cannot do that. Bad idea. That is for rich people.

The education savings accounts, it was the Republican party who stood up against the naysayers of the Democrat party saying, This is bad for America, it is bad for public education to have education savings accounts.

Mr. Speaker, I will tell the Members that as the father of two little boys, one who is a 10-year-old who is a straight A student, who has taken advantage of books and education and computers and technology, the opportunity for him to be no different than other children who want to learn and read, for parents who get up and go to work every day and work hard to save money for that education for that child is important; also the parent of a 6-year-old Downs syndrome little boy, which my wife and I are, I know that our son needs more investment in not only his education but his development, just to make sure that he can

stand on his own two feet and have an opportunity to make a go of it by himself.

That is why we offer the education savings account. That is why we cut capital gains. That is why we had a \$500 per child tax credit. That is why we raised the exemption for death taxes. That is why just 2 weeks ago this House voted 422 to nothing on what had been controversial years before, to say we should raise the earning limits for seniors. We should not deny senior citizens who choose to work, which allows them not only to be in business but also to be healthier and happier, not to lose their social security because the Tax Code said that was the right way.

I am proud of my party. I am proud of my party and people back home and groups that will work to say, We need to make it more difficult to raise taxes. We need to make it more difficult, and it is a simple matter. That is what this amendment is all about.

I will confess, we may not get the amount of votes that we need today. We will get a majority of the votes, but we will not get enough. But the dream lives on forever. We intend to continue with this. Yes, it is done at tax time. It is done at a time when people understand that there is a voice, not a voice in the wilderness but a voice on the floor of the House of Representatives, the people's body.

We are going to get 240 votes on this today. We are going to stand up and talk about how it should be more difficult to raise taxes. I am proud of what my party stands for. I know what the other side stands for.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I find it kind of intriguing that the Republicans are trying to rewrite history, for if we go back to when this administration took over, they inherited a debt approaching \$280 billion a year from the Bush administration. It was in 1993 that this Congress bit the bullet and passed a deficit reduction bill which massively cut spending, and it did adjust some taxes, but the effect of that legislation was to bring this country where we are today, enjoying the greatest economic growth in its history.

If it makes Republicans feel good and they want to take credit for it, let them do it. But let us not rewrite history, because this administration, when it took over, inherited an annual debt approaching if not exceeding some \$280 billion a year in red ink.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY).

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the kindest characterization of this proposal would be to say that it is disingenuous. It is obviously disingenuous, because the party that is offering it here, the majority party in this House, several

years ago adopted an internal resolution that required a two-thirds majority to raise revenues by any vote taken by the House of Representatives.

What have we seen in the carrying out of the adoption of that change in the rules here? What we have seen is that virtually every time the issue has come up, the leadership of the House has waived the requirement. So one can only conclude that this proposal for a super majority, anti-democratic super majority to raise revenues, is one that is not really believed in by those people who are offering it, because every time they have had an opportunity to put it into place they have abandoned it. They have walked away from it. It seems quite clear that they do not even believe in it themselves.

Why would we want to do this? Why would we put fiscal policy in a Constitution when every sound economic principle everywhere says that that would be a foolish thing to do? Why would we want to do it? How would we react to emergencies? How would we respond to a crisis in agriculture? How would we respond to national emergencies of various kinds? How would we respond to natural calamities when we needed to respond aggressively and forthrightly and attentively to those problems when people were in serious trouble?

Look what is happening in the farm belt all across America. Look what is happening to agriculture as a result of the 1996 farm bill and the destructive impact that that has had upon ranchers and farmers all across the country. We are not even responding to that adequately now under the leadership of the Republican party in this House. Imagine how much more difficult it would be if we required a two-thirds majority.

They have turned their backs on ranchers and farmers. Now they want to get even further away from them and other people who would face difficult circumstances in our country by implanting this super majority, this anti-democratic super majority provision in the Constitution as an amendment to the United States Constitution. It is an absurd proposal.

Why are they advancing the proposal? Ostensibly they are advancing the proposal because they would like everyone to think that taxes are too high, that Federal taxes are too high. Of course, everyone who is struggling with their income tax form these days is prepared to believe that, or many people are prepared to believe it, I assume.

But the fact of the matter is that the situation is quite different from that. Let us just take a look at certain people in our economy and how the income tax code relates to them.

The median income in America today is about \$46,700. That is the median income; half below, half above. The average Federal income tax rate for a family of four at the median income in 1999, last year, is 7.5 percent. In 1981, it

was 11.8 percent. The fact of the matter is that the tax rate for people at the median income is lower now than it was in 1981, and in fact, is the lowest it has been since 1966.

If one is making half of the median income, he is in effect at a negative income tax as a result of the changes in the earned income tax credit that were put into place by the Clinton administration as a result of the 1993 budget proposal. As a matter of fact, that budget proposal also made some adjustments downward for people at the lower-income ranges, as well. So the situation for people at the median income is better today than it was in 1981. People making half of the median income are not paying any income taxes whatsoever.

What about people making a little bit more money? Suppose someone is making twice the median income. Suppose they are making somewhere in excess of \$90,000 a year for a family of four. The fact of the matter is that the median income for them is now 14.1 percent. What was it in 1981? It was 19.1 percent.

1215

The median income for a family of four and the tax rate for the median income, people making twice the median income is lower than it was in 1981. Even after tax income, the after-tax rate for people at the top 1 percent is even lower than it was in 1987. The fact of the matter is that taxes are taking less of a bite of the income, Federal taxes, Federal income taxes, taking less of a bite out of the income of Americans than they were back in 1981.

This proposal is not just disingenuous. It is not just a proposal in which the proponents of it do not really believe themselves. They have abandoned it every time it is come up. They know very well it is not going to pass. It is not going to get two-thirds of the majority of this House voting for it.

It is simply put up here for partisan political reasons in the hope that they can deceive a few people here and there around the country, that the Republican Party really wants to see taxes cut, that they really believe in lower taxes.

When it was pointed out here just a few moments ago with the tax shelter hustlers, the front page of *Forbes* magazine what they really want to do, what they really want to do is protect the privileges of the very, very wealthy.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. HINCHEY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, certainly it is important to point out they will freeze into place all of these special interests provisions, all of these loopholes. The gentleman focused, I think, very eloquently on the effects of their proposal and has also noted that what we mainly have been dealing with here, as is the case around every tax

filing day, is hot air from the Republicans.

I would like to redirect the gentleman's attention from hot air to dirty air and another section that would be frozen into place, and that is section 527, which the gentleman joined with me last week in sponsoring legislation to address. Being from New York State, did the gentleman have occasion to see the ads that some Texans ran against Senator McCain there in New York State?

Mr. HINCHEY. Yes, I believe I did.

Mr. DOGGETT. Even though Texas has some problems, having out-distanced Los Angeles, which is one of the cities that has the dirtiest air in the country in many areas, the claim was that one candidate was not enough of an environmentalist, but instead of doing that as a direct campaign, they used a 527 organization where the gentleman could not even find out who put the ad on television.

Mr. HINCHEY. Yes.

Mr. DOGGETT. Instead of doing the kind of hot air measure that we have here today, I believe the gentleman joined with me in saying that that was wrong and that taxpayers ought to have a right to be able to find out whether it is some Texas friend of one of the other presidential candidates or whether it is Chinese money or Iraqi money or Cuban money or just some homegrown special interests that wants to pour money into these kind of Swiss bank accounts of the political season this year to make unlimited expenditures, but never tell the taxpayers who is funding these kinds of hate campaigns that the gentleman must have seen in New York State.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, we did see them in New York State, and there were advertisements that were put forth principally on Long Island; and they, of course, were deceitful. They were deceitful in a variety of ways. First of all, they pretended that the proponent of those ads, the beneficiary of those ads, was one who had a sound record in environmental protection when we know that the environmental record of Governor George W. Bush in Texas is an abysmal record.

In the air quality arena alone, for example, the city of Houston now has surpassed Los Angeles with the worst air quality in the country, as a result of the fact that Governor Bush has vetoed every attempt to pass sound environmental control legislation in the State and turned his back on environmental quality in the State generally.

Furthermore, the ads that the gentleman is talking about now, which were allowed as part of the Tax Code, those ads that the gentleman very appropriately brought to our attention today and which are allowed in a section of the Tax Code are totally deceitful and point out the reason why we need campaign finance reform and point out the illegitimacy of this proposal.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, we said, look, whether those ads are put on by

a Democrat, a pro-environmental group or an anti-environmental group, let us at least tell the taxpayers who is financing them. And this Republican leadership, the same Republican leadership that could have just sent all of us and the American people a cassette with the speeches that they gave last session or the session before that or the session before that or the session before that on this same sorry proposal.

They said they did not have time to consider that. They basically said that the only way they can get through this election was to continue taking unlimited amounts of secret money, including foreign money, that can be dumped into these political Swiss bank accounts called 527's and continue to stuff misinformation into our mailboxes and run hate on to the airwaves. They refused to consider the proposal that the gentleman personally has sponsored, did they not?

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, in response to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY), who is my good friend, during the time on the floor the gentleman wanted us to question why we are advancing this idea, what possibly could Republicans be for. Why are we advancing this idea? It is quite simple. We would like to make it more difficult to raise taxes on the American taxpayer.

Secondly, the gentleman asked, oh, my gosh if we had this, how would we respond to emergencies? The obvious implication is, could not raise taxes, could not raise taxes in the event of an emergency.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is very interesting that if we follow this, then we would have to respond to a crisis or any crisis in the following manner: number one, we would have to raise taxes; that is the first thing the Democrat Party wants to do. Number two, raise spending. Go spend it, go spend all of the taxpayers money, spend more and more and more. Number three, increase inefficiency, bigger government. Give it to the government, bring it to Washington, D.C.

My proposition is quite the opposite. My proposition is that it should be more about efficiency. Under a post-tax limitation amendment, the first thing that would happen is, government would have to increase efficiency. Government would have to look inward to itself.

It would have to do the same thing that I do at home with my wife and my family. We would have to live within a budget; could not raise taxes as easily; have to work within what we have; have to make some hard decisions; have to prioritize. It would increase efficiency because it would require the Government and the Congress to make tough decisions. Today, the path of least resistance, let us raise taxes, let us raise spending, let us just go do the same old Washington dance.

Secondly, under a post-tax limitation amendment, it would mean that we

would have to then look at raising spending. How are we going to do that? Well, we would do that if there is an emergency because we had already squeezed the lemon dry. We could already prove to people back home we have looked inward, we have been efficient. Now what we have to do is to raise spending.

Remember, we are in a surplus condition. We do need to use more efficiently the money that has been given to us. Lastly, the thing that would be required, which is what the taxpayers, I believe, sent all of us to Congress to do, and that is lastly then to consider the last option or the least easy option, raise taxes.

This, to me, is what it is all about, that the Congress of the United States should have to come on the floor of the House of Representatives to debate the issues, to talk about efficiency, to do the right thing for the taxpayer back home; but the easiest thing should not be to raise taxes. That is where the minority party, that is where they fall virtually every time. That is where they are falling today. That is the difference between these two parties in Washington, D.C. Somebody that says let us just raise taxes, let us go raise taxes on the people who have the money, let us go raise taxes on people who have been successful, people who create our economy, people who provide jobs, we are going to make it more difficult. That is what this argument is about.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS).

(Mr. STEARNS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to come down here and speak on behalf of this amendment. I say with tongue in cheek that the Republicans celebrate July 4 and the Democrat Party celebrates April 15.

For most Americans, April 15 is a dreaded day. It is a feared day, a day in which taxpayers across the country are concentrating and reflecting on America's most frustrating and complex tax system. I do not know how many millions of pages there are, but it is enough.

So it is altogether appropriate, just before the April 15, we should reflect on our Nation's Tax Code and the problems it imposes upon taxpayers in America. So today we will be considering a most meaningful piece of legislation addressing the shortcoming of the system, the tax limitation amendment which will force Congress to garner a supermajority before approving any tax increase.

Later we will have this opportunity to vote for the bill, to scrap the Tax Code so we can replace this burdensome tax system with something far more fair and equitable.

Tax limitation would require in this House and in the Senate, if adopted, that there be a real consensus to raise taxes. It would take a two-thirds vote, which means we will not have a recurrence of one of the largest tax increases in American history in 1993 with President Clinton and Vice President Gore's proposal.

When I look at this, I go back and think about our Founding Fathers. These honorable leaders had the foresight to mandate a two-thirds majority vote on certain priority issues in this country. James Madison, a vocal supporter of majority rule, argued that the greatest threat to liberty in a republic came from unrestrained majority rule, and that is why they proposed two-thirds majority for conviction in impeachment trials, expulsion of a Member of Congress, override of a presidential veto, a quorum of two-thirds of the Senate to elect a President, to consent to a treaty and proposing constitutional amendments.

So if it is good enough for those, I think certainly it would be good enough for deciding whether we are having taxes here.

There were seven of these that were already in the Constitution when they wrote the document and since then they have added three more.

My colleague, Daniel Webster, obviously a great renowned legend of this great body, said, quote, "the power to tax is the power to destroy."

We voted yesterday against \$116 billion in higher taxes and user fees as proposed in the administration's budget. Americans are simply taxed too much. It is both the Federal, State, and local level where it adds up to almost 40 percent; and, of course, there are many areas that we are taxed and we do not even know it.

Gasoline tax is one of them, corporate income tax, excise tax, State and local, as I mentioned. Though the average American family is paying somewhat less in Federal income tax, as I pointed out, the overall tax burden is approaching 40 percent. So this amendment is needed, something that many States are already doing.

I am glad the Federal Government is stepping up to the plate, and I urge strong support on both sides of the aisle to align yourself with what the States are doing, align yourself with the people and move forward to pass this amendment.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Goddard, Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT).

1230

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), the member of the powerful Committee on Rules.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the constitutional amendment requiring a two-thirds majority to raise taxes on hardworking American families. The tax limitation amendment is powerful, yet responsible. By requiring

two-thirds majority approval for any tax increase, this Congress is showing its deep concern for the constant imbalance of raising taxes in order to increase spending. We are attempting to ensure that the American people will not be subject to the whimsical and shortsighted notions of Congress to raise taxes at the drop of a hat.

Presently 14 States across this country require a supermajority in their legislatures to raise taxes. What has been the result? Their State taxes grow much slower and State spending is reduced. Additionally, these States have seen their economies grow at a rate of almost one-third faster than the 36 States that have not adopted supermajority requirements for tax increases. One-third faster than the States that have not adopted supermajority requirements.

A strong majority of American taxpaying families support this effort, which will assure that future Congresses have support of the American public before they attempt to raise taxes.

Mr. Speaker, the bottom line is that today's taxes are too high. Americans pay more in taxes than they do for food, clothing, and shelter. Efforts to reduce these burdens on Americans is much too little. It is an economic fact that the Big-Government crowd would like to ignore.

It frustrates me to witness some of the largest tax increases this Nation has ever seen to pass with only one or two votes, and it frustrates me further to know that this body can vote to increase taxes on all Americans when all of America does not support such action.

So today I am asking my colleagues to take a long, hard look at the remarkable possibilities this legislation offers and offer their support for this amendment. Members who oppose this legislation are telling the American public that it does not bother this Congress to saddle our Nation, our Nation's taxpayers with economic policies that penalize rather than reward. Our action today will show a great deal about the direction of this Congress and this country and, most importantly, about the future of our children.

I want to leave behind a legacy of a strong economy, a strong future for our children, and not one burdened heavily with taxes, stifling growth, limiting opportunity. By requiring a supermajority to raise taxes, we will prevent further knee-jerk reactions by big government supporters who care more about the outcome of arcane Federal programs than the hard work of everyday people that I and this amendment support.

So ask my fellow Members to support the legislation today.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT) just stated that all of America does not support tax increases, and that is clearly true.

Last year, the Republicans in the House produced a massive tax cut bill. They passed it. They went home for the August break, came back, and that was the last we heard about of it because all of the American public did not support the direction of that tax cut bill because they felt that reducing the Federal debt was more important. Saving Social Security, and modernizing Medicare was more important.

I should also point out to the gentleman from Kansas that all of his district did not support his coming here. Who did? A majority did. So if a majority is good enough to get him here to Congress, if a majority is good enough to have this Congress declare war, I would think tax policy in this country should be made by that same majority.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT).

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I really had about made up my mind not to come over and even debate this amendment today. It is quite obvious that this is not a serious effort to amend the Constitution. What it is, instead, is a serious effort to make a political statement about taxation.

We have, every year now for the last 3 or 4 years, had this same proposal on the floor. There are not even any pretenses this year, because I am the ranking member of the Subcommittee on the Constitution of the Committee on the Judiciary. This amendment did not even come through the Subcommittee on the Constitution of the Committee on the Judiciary this year to be considered.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, what was the committee vote on the Committee on the Judiciary to recommend this resolution to passage?

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Well, beyond the Subcommittee on the Constitution, the bill did not even go through the full Committee on the Judiciary this year. It has in prior years. But if my colleagues are seriously saying that they are serious legislators and Members of Congress, and they take their job seriously, and they are going to amend the most sacred and profound document of our country, the United States Constitution, do they bring a proposed constitutional amendment to the floor of the United States House of Representatives without even going through the Subcommittee on the Constitution whose job it is to deliberate and decide on the merits of constitutional amendments? Do they circumvent the entire Committee on the Judiciary and go around that committee and bring it to the floor? Or do they go through the regular process?

So that in and of itself is an indication that this is a political exercise de-

signed to score political points and having nothing to do with the merits of whether there should be a constitutional amendment.

Now, we have gone through this time after time after time. In the past, I have tried to bring constructive amendments to the legislation. It was not a constitutional amendment when it was done before. It was legislation that one could try to amend and try to bring some rationale to.

But this year, it is a whole new proposal. It is a constitutional proposal. But it went around all of the processes. It is hard for any of us to take this seriously other than we must be getting close to April 15, tax day in this country, and the Republicans must be very interested in making political points about the level of taxation in this country, which is fine. I mean, they can make those political points. Nobody likes taxes. But we have to have some priorities in this country.

If my colleagues are going to be serious about a constitutional amendment that raises taxes, what about a constitutional amendment that deals with cutting taxes? Why should there be a different standard when we are talking about doing away with loopholes in a Tax Code then we would if we were raising taxes.

But this constitutional amendment would not give us any authority to have a supermajority. So this is not serious. It undermines the basic principle that our country is founded on, which is one person, one vote. It undermines my representational authority for the $\frac{1}{435}$ th of the people of this country that I represent, because, all of a sudden, to get something done, we would require a two-thirds majority vote rather than a simple majority.

If this were being taken seriously, it would have gone through the regular process. So I do not even know why I came to debate this. We are not engaging in any serious congressional activity. It is obvious from that, from the number of people on the floor. So I will yield back the balance of my time so that my colleagues on the Republican side can go ahead and make their political point.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG), a friend of the taxpayer, a gentleman who is a staunch supporter, a good conservative, chairman of the CATs, Conservative Action Team here.

(Mr. SHADEGG asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the tax limitation amendment. I want to commend the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) for bringing this amendment forward. I want to commend the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), his cosponsor. I want to commend the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) who has led this fight year in and year out.

1993 was not that long ago. Indeed, it seems to me like 1993 was just the snap

of a fingers or a blink of an eye ago. It was just a few short years ago that we were standing here in 1993. Yet, why is that year significant to this debate? Because if we were to return the tax burden on the average American family to the level of that tax burden just 7 years ago, in 1993, as a percentage of our economy, every American family would get a tax break, would get tax relief of \$2,500 a year. That is how much taxes have gone up as a proportion of our economy in just 7 short years, \$2,500 for the average family across America of four people.

Now, what does \$2,500 mean? It means an extra \$200 a month in their budget. The reality is, in this city, in this Congress, government has grown year in and year out, in good times and in bad times, the last 40 years straight. I believe the American people deserve a break.

Let me talk to that point. What would \$2,500 a year for the average family of four or \$200 a month for the average family of four mean? Well, in 1996, we were engaged in a debate about tax relief on the floor of this House.

Many of my colleagues said, well, the American people do not really want tax relief. So I went home, and I said to my scheduler, I want to spend an hour in front of a grocery store or drug store on one side of my district talking to people, and I want to spend an hour in front of a grocery store or drug store on the other side of my district talking to people.

I went first to the east side of my district. The east side of my district is middle- to upper middle-income Americans. I stood there on the corner, and I talked to them about this issue. The first problem I had was to convince them that I really was the Congressman in that area.

But once I got beyond that, their second concern was, look, politicians will never cut taxes. You do not believe in cutting taxes. You will never give this. This is just political talk.

When I explained to them, no, we were really serious about this. On the east side of my district, they said, Congressman, sure we could use some tax relief. It is important to us. Almost 70 percent of them said to me, Absolutely. Give me some tax relief.

But the important part of this discussion was what occurred on the west side of my district. On the west side of my district, we are talking middle- to lower middle-income and below. I stood in front of a drug store on the west side of my District, and voter after voter after voter after voter, citizen after citizen that I got to engage in this discussion, once I get beyond the, no, you will never really give us any tax relief, and got into the substance, they said, Congressman, if you could give us any break at all, it would make a huge difference in our lives.

The people who are struggling to get by, those Americans who can barely pay their bills, who wake up each morning and struggle to get their kids

fed and get them off to school, and the husband goes off to work and the wife also has to go back off to work, and they go through their day, and they come home, and they get their kids, and they struggle to get them to Little League or piano practice and get the homework done and get them back in bed, those Americans just barely getting by said to me, Congressman, if you could just give me a little bit of a break.

What have we done to those Americans in the last 7 years? We have added \$2,500 to their tax burden. We have increased their tax burden on those poor, working, struggling-to-get-by families by \$200 a month.

Now, what does this amendment say? Does this amendment say, let us give them a break and give them that \$200 back, let us work, give them a chance? It simply says let us make it a little harder to raise taxes again. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG) would have gone to that same town and asked the people on the west side of town what the major priorities in Congress are, they would have probably told him, Mr. Congressman, we need more money for defense. We have to increase the readiness of our armed services. And, by the way, Mr. Congressman, the bridge on Main Street is in need of repair. And we sure could use that 90 percent Federal funding for that new bridge.

Then as my colleague went to the east side of town and talked to the poor individuals, they would have probably said, Yes, we could use some relief. But, Mr. Congressman, my son or my daughter wants to go to college, and, boy, if you could increase the Pell Grants for that child of mine, that would sure be neat. The earned-income tax credit, that could use a look-see again by the Congress. Yes, that will cost some money.

1245

And the point I am trying to make, my colleagues, is that all these needs and desires of the American public cost money.

My Republican colleagues seem to think that defense money comes from heaven and not from taxpayers and any other social program, like Medicare and drug benefits and other things that we fight for on this floor, that comes from the taxpayer. And the truth of the matter is that all those expenditures are funded by the taxpayers.

So, sure, we would all like to decrease taxes; but when we ask our constituents what program will they forego, we will find out that budget cutting is not the easiest in the world. We are going to put in big money for the National Institutes of Health, which we should do, to study children's diabetes and cancer and all sorts of other diseases. But those programs are funded off these nasty things we are talking about called taxes.

There is an old saying, "Don't cut you, don't cut me, cut the man behind the tree." We cannot find the man behind the tree nor the tree. So my colleagues should not come before the body and say, boy, we need two-thirds to have any tax increase. If that is so, then we should have two-thirds to have any spending increases too for their favorite programs and my favorite programs. That would be fair. But that is not what the Founding Fathers envisioned.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL).

(Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, Mr. Speaker.

We went through this exercise on the balanced budget amendment for many years. The other side failed to understand the difference between promising to balance the budget and actually doing it. As it turned out, all they had to do to balance the budget was to support President Bush in 1990 and President Clinton in 1993. For the most part, they did not; but we balanced the budget over their objections.

The other side continues to misplace the distinction between promise and reality. They argue they need a constitutional amendment not to raise taxes, when all they simply need to do is not to raise taxes. In fact, the House voted yesterday 420 to 1 not to raise taxes. But I guess for the authors of this amendment that vote was too close.

This is tax frolic week, or tax press release week. To give another example of the deep thought that has gone into this week, tomorrow we take up a bill to repeal the Federal income tax with a promise to replace it in the future. We have to promise at that point, not knowing where we are going, that we are going to come up with a substitute, perhaps a flat tax to benefit the wealthy, or a 60 percent retail sales tax. But if both this bill and tomorrow's bill were to pass, it would require a two-thirds vote of Congress to replace the repealed Federal income tax.

Twenty years ago, I was standing in a classroom telling students of my reverence for the Constitution. What would I say to them about the shenanigans occurring here today? I would not even want to face them.

The Constitution requires a two-thirds majority vote in the House in only three instances: overriding a President's veto, submission of a constitutional amendment to the States, and expelling a Member from this House. Those are matters that are much more weighty than the one that faces us today.

Mr. Speaker, the Founding Fathers examined majority rule and what it meant. They rejected the notion that one-third of the Members of this institution should be in a position to deter-

mine the fate of legislation. They, led by Mr. Madison, reviewed the question of what constituted a majority in a legislative body. They concluded, based upon the bad experience of the Nation under the Articles of the Confederation, where nine of 13 States were positioned to raise eventual revenue, that it was simply a bad idea.

Upholding the current Constitution is truly, truly the conservative position in this debate. Holding the country hostage to the tyranny of the minority of one-third is, indeed, the radical position. But, apparently, Mr. Speaker, it makes better sense for a good press release than to stand with the Constitution.

So let us proceed. Crank out the press releases, go home for a 2-week break, and then, when we come back, let us do something real and substantive for a change.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, will the Chair advise each side how much time is remaining on this issue.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KLECZKA) has 3 minutes remaining; the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Bloomfield Hills, Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG).

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I also want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), and it would not be right if I did not thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON), who has really been the crusader on this issue for a long, long time, and one I think that we ought to get straight and pass.

Since the beginning of the year, this Republican majority has succeeded in passing several tax cuts for the American people. We believe that couples should no longer be punished by the Tax Code because they are simply married.

We enacted legislation that prevents senior citizens from being taxed excessively, and particularly when they continue to be positive contributors to society. And we had bipartisan support for that.

We passed tax reduction legislation to help ensure that small businesses and family farms remain in the family.

But while we shall continue to offer tax cuts every year, today we have a historic opportunity to take a great leap forward by limiting tax increases forever. Passage of this act would require two-thirds of Congress to raise taxes. It is too easy, too easy, for this government to pass unnecessary tax increases on the hardworking people of this country. I repeat that: it is too easy.

If President Clinton, for example, had got his way this year in his budget, he would have increased taxes by \$237 billion over the next 10 years. Why, Mr. Speaker, is the President trying to

raise taxes in an era of budget surpluses? Why? Instead of raising taxes, should we not find ways to give the surplus, part of it at least, back to the people who have overpaid?

With a surplus on hand, and CBO projecting future surpluses, there is no need for any new tax increases. Congress should be focusing on forcing Federal bureaucrats to cut waste, fraud and abuse and spend their budgets wisely. For too long the Federal Government has raised taxes on a whim. This bill is the best way to ensure that taxes are increased only when it is absolutely necessary.

Currently, 14 States, as has been previously mentioned, have tax limitation provisions, and it has been demonstrated that States with limitation provisions have seen a reduction in the growth of spending. For a needed tax increase, a two-thirds majority would not be that difficult to obtain. We simply want to give the public the security that the Federal Government will not raise unnecessary and hasty tax increases.

I think it is about time that we restore the public's faith in government. Instead of only saying we are against new taxes, let us actually show them. I urge my colleagues to pass this legislation and protect Americans from the Washington big spenders.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON), representing the Sixth District of Texas, who brought this effort to the floor of the House of Representatives, and who is one of the most articulate spokesmen for the Tax Limitation Amendment.

(Mr. BARTON of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this tax limitation constitutional amendment. I want to commend the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), representing the Fifth District of Texas, for his excellent leadership this year.

I have been able to listen to some of the debate this year. Certainly I have led the debate in prior years for the proponents of it. I have a few simple things to say in the 2½ minutes that I have remaining.

First of all, my constituents want tax limitation. I have never attended a town meeting, a public forum of any sort where this issue came up that less than 90 percent of the people there did not say they wanted this in the strongest possible terms.

I just did my taxes. I sent a check in to the Internal Revenue Service early this week. I know for a fact that our taxes are too high. In spite of the robust economy that we have, taxation of the American people is at an all-time high. If we include State and local taxes, there are people in our country today that are in a tax bracket approaching 60 percent of their income. At the Federal level, taxation is well

over 20 percent. And that is just on income taxes and does not include Social Security taxes and Medicare taxes.

The Tax Limitation Amendment is fairly straightforward. It would take a two-thirds vote to pass a tax increase. Two-thirds is a larger fraction than one-half. It does not say we cannot have tax increases, it does not say tax increases will never be necessary; but it says there should be a national consensus of a supermajority that a tax increase is definitely needed. We should look at spending decreases; we should look at efficiency before we look at increasing taxes.

I would remind Members in this body that the original Constitution had 100 percent, a 100 percent prohibition against income tax increases, because income taxes were unconstitutional until early in this century when the 19th amendment made it constitutional to pass an income tax. Since that time, the marginal tax rate on the American public has gone from 1 percent to 38 percent. That is a 3,800 percent increase.

So to put it simply, a tax limitation works. There is no better time to pass a constitutional amendment making it harder to raise taxes than right now when we are in a budget surplus. The opponents of the amendment do not say that it would not work. They are opposed to it precisely for the reason that it would work.

I hope we can get a two-thirds vote necessary to pass this to the Senate today. If for some reason we are not successful, this amendment will come back. The more the American people know about it, the more it becomes a part of the lexicon of the political process, and the greater the likelihood that we will pass this.

Again, I want to commend the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHAD-EGG), and others for their strong leadership on this. I will vote for it and encourage every Member of this body to vote for it.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KLECZKA) has 3 minutes.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, I think we have had what I would call a spirited debate today, but one has to wonder why this proposal comes up every April. Congress comes in session in January. We stay around until October. Why do we not have a vote on this particular issue in July or February? For the last 5 years it has always come up in April.

But when in April? Well, they try to schedule it April 15. Well, my gosh, why April 15? Well, that is the day that we have to file our taxes, the last day we have to file our taxes. Why did they do it this date this year? They got snookered. April 15 is on a Saturday, and they cannot keep Members of Congress here on a Saturday.

So this is more for show, my friends, than for goal, as evidenced by the vote we are going to have very shortly, which will provide that this constitutional amendment will not pass, nor should it. Nor should it. If, in fact, a majority in Congress can send our young men and women to war; if a majority in Congress can cut benefits for education, Social Security, Medicare; if a majority can do all these things, then why not also deal with tax policy in the same manner?

1300

My colleagues on the other side know that is correct. And if this were a secret ballot, this thing would go down to the person, it would fail 435-0. But that is not the case. It is April 15. We have to make a statement about taxes.

And tomorrow we have a better one for my colleagues. Tomorrow we are going to repeal the entire Tax Code. We are going to repeal the Tax Code tomorrow. And what are we going to replace it with? I do not know. We do not have a plan for that yet. That is how phoney this business is.

We had a hearing before the Committee on Ways and Means on a bill sponsored by one of their Members and one on our side. It provided for a national sales tax. The thing got worse as we questioned the witnesses. It started out with a 30-percent sales tax on every good and service, including clothes, prescription drugs. And by the time we got done talking to the Joint Committee on Taxation, to be revenue neutral, that national sales tax would be 60 percent.

So we are going to trust them with tax policy around here to tax my constituents 60 percent on their drug costs, when now they are going to Canada to get a break?

This constitutional amendment, Mr. Speaker, is not necessary, and I urge my colleagues to not support it.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, before I pass to the remaining and closing speaker that we have, I would like to thank three people: Marty McGuinness from my staff; Steve Waguespack, who is from the staff of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON); and Elizabeth Kowal from the staff of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL).

Mr. Speaker, I yield the remaining time to the gentleman from the Fourth District of Texas (Mr. HALL), a gentleman who is a close friend of mine and the cosponsor and co-lead of this joint resolution.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I do think it has been a spirited debate. I have not heard all of it. If I repeat some of the things of those who propose this, forgive me for it. But I would like to answer some of the questions that have been asked.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KLECZKA) made a very good speech and asked why are we having it at this particular time. Well, that answer is pretty simple. We asked for it at this time

because this is the time when most of the people of the United States are thinking about how high their taxes are. I think it is good to try to get their attention.

I believe, though, that we may be starting at the wrong level, we may be starting up here, when we really ought to be starting in our precincts and in our counties in our States at home. If we only close the gap today, or if we come close to closing the gap, or whatever votes we get today, we are going to count them for next year; and we are going to be in there trying to get it to emanate from the grassroots.

Because I think if we get the grassroots people and ask them the question, do they think it ought to be a little bit tougher to vote taxes on hardworking Americans, I think about all of them would say, absolutely yes.

It has also been suggested that this was politics. Everything we do up here has some politics to it. I would always say to my colleagues that it is not bad politics to be telling hardworking Americans that we are going to make it a little tougher to tax them. I think that is good politics. If it is politics, it is doggone good politics where I come from.

I cannot go anywhere in my district and talk to anybody there that does not complain about the taxes. Now, ask them, go home, conservative, Democrat, liberal, whatever, ask them, would they like for it to be a little more difficult for the United States Congress to tax them and take money out of their left hip pocket? I guarantee my colleagues that nine out of nine and probably a hundred out of a hundred are going to tell us, absolutely yes.

So I am here to express my support for the tax limitation agreement. We would not have had the sad 1986 Tax Reform Act if it had taken two-thirds, a reform act that set this country back to where we are just now getting over it. A lot of things would not have happened if it would have taken two-thirds.

There is a lot of difference in asking two-thirds vote to tax people and asking two-thirds vote to support various programs. I agree with the gentleman on the fact that it should only take a majority on supporting some of these programs. But when we go to taxing the American people, a direct tax from us to them, from our mouth to their left hip pocket, I think it ought to take two-thirds of us. I believe most of the people in this country, all of the good-thinking people in this country, would say, yes, make it a little tougher up there in Washington, D.C., for them to take our money away from us.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the H.J. Res. 94 and commend my colleagues from Texas for advancing this important legislation. Requiring a two-thirds supermajority for tax increases is one of the most critical hurdles we can erect to check future growth in government.

This supermajority requirement for tax increases is a tested model that has proven ef-

fective. Fourteen states now have tax limitation amendments in place and have shown great progress in restraining taxes and spending. It is no accident that those states are among the most impressive economic growth states in the nation.

Alternatively, as a resident of upstate New York where we suffer one of the highest tax burdens in the nation, I have seen firsthand how big government and escalating tax rates stifle economic growth. For many decades, Democratic leadership in New York enacted tax increase after tax increase and government expanded practically unchecked.

Upstate New York is not sharing in the nation's economic prosperity and is in fact seeing its population leave for opportunities in other regions of the country. This is painful for me as a father of three who would like to see opportunities for my children to spend their lives in upstate New York. If upstate New York were a state by itself, it would rank near the bottom in terms of economic growth. I believe it is the tax climate that has driven job growth away from our region.

Therefore, this amendment before us today is extremely important effort to show that government can check itself. Mr. Speaker, this is important legislation. I thank my friend, Mr. SESSIONS, for his hard work on this issue and urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4163, the Taxpayer Bill of Rights. This legislation brings much-needed simplification to our tax code and ensures that a taxpayer's privacy will be protected.

Taxpayers should be assured that the information they provide to the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) will be kept secure and confidential. Information on earnings, property and other income should be kept private, and this bill ensures that it will be. The Taxpayer Bill of Rights requires IRS supervisors, not rank-and-file workers, to determine if there are sufficient grounds to warrant an investigation into an individual's tax return.

The bill also requires states to conduct annual on-site investigations of contractors who receive federal tax information and process it for state agencies to ensure that this information is being safeguarded. Further, this legislation requires the IRS to notify taxpayers in all instances in which the IRS has unlawfully obtained a taxpayer's return or other information.

The legislation contains other important consumer protections, including a provision that tightens the requirements for banks to get access to a taxpayer's records. And, it requires that all third parties keep this information confidential.

H.R. 4163 helps taxpayers who are self-employed by simplifying the formula for estimated taxes. By allowing taxpayers to use one interest rate in calculating estimated tax, much time and effort will be saved. In addition, the bill's increase, from \$1,000 to \$2,000, in the threshold over which penalties must be paid for failure to pay estimated tax will help thousands of self-employed persons each year who miscalculate their taxes.

I urge my colleagues to support this important initiative. As tax day approaches, this is the least we can do to reduce the regulatory burden the IRS imposes on the American taxpayer.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I fully support H.J. Res. 94, which calls for an amendment to the United States Constitution prohibiting pas-

sage of tax increases without a two-thirds majority in each house of Congress, except in emergency cases such as a military conflict. I am a cosponsor of this legislation, I have voted for similar legislation in the past, and I remain committed to passing the strongest tax limitation amendment possible.

Opponents claim, and will continue to claim, that constitutional amendments on taxing and spending make it harder to operate government as we know it. That is exactly the point—fiscal reality proves to us that we need an instrument, a tool, to control government spending and limit raising taxes.

The Federal Government has run deficits for 56 of the last 66 years leading to a \$5.4 trillion national debt. This is not a short-term trend. It points to a fundamental flaw in the political system that makes a constitutional solution both necessary and appropriate. We need to pass H.J. Res. 94 to renew our commitment to fiscal discipline. Otherwise, irresponsible spending and higher federal taxes will continue to own us, cripple our economy and mortgage our children's future. Congress needs the legal and moral authority of a Constitutional amendment making it more difficult to raise taxes.

This is not a radical idea as some have suggested. In fact, 14 states have enacted tax limitation measures. Since 1980, the state I represent, Delaware, has required a three-fifths vote to raise any tax. As a result, balanced budgets are the rule, not the exception, in Delaware.

Yesterday, the House rejected the \$116 billion in new taxes and fees proposed in President Clinton's FY2001 budget by a vote of 420 to 1. I believe that vote represents an endorsement of the idea that higher taxes are not needed when the Federal Government is operating a budget surplus. Today, we need to go the next step and make it more difficult to raise taxes anytime other than during a military emergency. I urge those same 420 members to support this resolution today.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member rises in principled opposition to House Joint Resolution 94, the so-called tax limitation amendment. Certainly it would be more politically expedient to simply go along and vote in support of a constitutional amendment requiring two-thirds approval by Congress for any tax increases. However, as a matter of principle and conscience, this Member cannot do that.

As this Member stated when a similar amendment was considered by the House in the past, there is a great burden of proof to deviate from the basic principle of our democracy—the principle of majority rule. Unfortunately, this Member does not believe the proposed amendment to the U.S. Constitution is consistent or complementary to this important principle.

There should be no question of this Member's continued and enthusiastic support for a balanced budget and a constitutional amendment requiring such a balanced budget. In the judgment of this Member, tax increases should not be employed to achieve a balanced budget; balanced budgets should be achieved by economic growth and, as appropriate, tax cuts. This is why this Member in the past has supported the inclusion of a super majority requirement for tax increases in the rules of the House. However, to go beyond that and amend the Constitution is, in this Member's

opinion, inappropriate and, therefore, the reason why this Member will vote against House Joint Resolution 94.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I understand that the House has considered proposals like this several times in recent years. So I can see why the debate about it sounds so rehearsed. I get the impression that many Members have heard all the arguments before, and I suspect that the debate will not change many minds about the proposal.

But as a new Member I must say this resolution strikes me as one of the oddest pieces of legislation that I've encountered yet—and I think it's one of the worst.

I'm not a lawyer, but it's clear that the language of the proposal is an invitation to litigation—in other words, to getting the courts involved even further in the law-making process. To say that Congress can define when a constitutional requirement would apply, provided that the Congressional decision is "reasonable," is to ask for lawsuits challenging whatever definition might be adopted. Aren't there enough lawsuits already over the tax laws? Do we need to invite more?

But more important than the technical aspects of this proposal, I think it is bad because it moves away from the basic principle of democracy—majority rule.

Under this proposal, there would be another category of bills that would require a two-thirds vote of both the House and the Senate. That's bad enough as it applies here in the House, but consider what that means in the Senate. There, if any 34 Senators are opposed to something that take a two-thirds vote, it cannot be passed. And, of course, each state has the same representation regardless of population.

Consider what that means if the Senators in opposition are those from the 17 States with the fewest residents.

We don't yet have this year's census numbers, of course, but the most recent estimates that I have seen show that the total population of the 17 least-populous states is somewhere in the neighborhood of 20 million people. That's a respectable number, but remember that the population of the country is 270 million or more.

So, what this resolution would do would be to give Senators representing about 7 percent of the American people more power to block something even if it has sweeping support in the rest of the country.

Right now, that kind of supermajority is needed under the constitution to ratify treaties, propose Constitutional amendments, and to do a few other things.

But this resolution does not deal with things of that kind. It deals only with certain tax bills—bills that under the constitution have to originate here, in the House. Those are the bills that would be covered by this increase in the power of Senators who could represent a small minority of the American people.

Why would we want to do that? Are the proponents of this constitutional amendment so afraid of majority rule on the subject of "internal revenue"? Why else would they be so eager to reduce the stature of this body, the House of Representatives, as compared with our colleagues in the Senate.

Remember, that's what this is all about—"internal revenue," however that term might be defined by Congress or by the courts. When Congress debates taxes, it is deciding

what funds are to be raised under Congress's Constitutional authority to "pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States." Those are serious and important decisions, to be sure, but what is wrong with continuing to have them made under the principle of majority rule—meaning by the members of Congress who represent the majority of the American people?

So, Mr. Speaker, I cannot support this proposed change in the Constitution. Our country has gotten along well without it for two centuries. It is not needed. It would not solve any problem—in fact, it probably would create new ones—and it would weaken the basic principle of democratic government, majority rule. It should not be approved.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 471, the previous question is ordered on the joint resolution.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the joint resolution.

The question was taken.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 234, nays 192, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 119]

YEAS—234

Aderholt	Chambliss	Gallegly
Andrews	Chenoweth-Hage	Ganske
Archer	Coble	Gekas
Armey	Coburn	Gibbons
Bachus	Collins	Gilchrest
Baker	Combest	Gilman
Ballenger	Condit	Goode
Barcia	Cooksey	Goodlatte
Barr	Cox	Goodling
Barrett (NE)	Cramer	Gordon
Bartlett	Crane	Goss
Barton	Cubin	Graham
Bass	Cunningham	Granger
Berkley	Danner	Green (TX)
Berry	Davis (VA)	Green (WI)
Biggart	Deal	Greenwood
Bilbray	DeLay	Gutknecht
Bilirakis	DeMint	Hall (TX)
Bishop	Diaz-Balart	Hansen
Bliley	Dickey	Hastings (WA)
Blunt	Doolittle	Hayes
Boehner	Duncan	Hayworth
Bonilla	Dunn	Hefley
Bono	Ehlers	Herger
Boswell	Ehrlich	Hillery
Brady (TX)	Emerson	Hobson
Bryant	English	Hoekstra
Burr	Etheridge	Horn
Burton	Everett	Hulshof
Buyer	Ewing	Hunter
Callahan	Fletcher	Hutchinson
Calvert	Foley	Isakson
Camp	Forbes	Istook
Canady	Fossella	Jenkins
Cannon	Fowler	John
Castle	Franks (NJ)	Johnson, Sam
Chabot	Frelinghuysen	Jones (NC)

Kasich	Ose	Shimkus
Kelly	Oxley	Shows
King (NY)	Packard	Shuster
Kingston	Pallone	Simpson
Knollenberg	Paul	Skeen
Kolbe	Pease	Skelton
Kuykendall	Peterson (PA)	Smith (MI)
LaHood	Petri	Smith (NJ)
Largent	Pickering	Smith (TX)
Latham	Pitts	Souder
LaTourette	Pombo	Spence
Lazio	Portman	Stearns
Leach	Pryce (OH)	Stump
Lewis (CA)	Quinn	Sununu
Lewis (KY)	Radanovich	Sweeney
Linder	Ramstad	Talent
LoBiondo	Regula	Tancred
Lucas (KY)	Reynolds	Tauzin
Lucas (OK)	Riley	Taylor (MS)
Maloney (CT)	Roemer	Taylor (NC)
Manzullo	Rogan	Terry
Martinez	Rogers	Thomas
McCarthy (NY)	Rohrabacher	Thornberry
McCollum	Ros-Lehtinen	Thune
McCrery	Roukema	Tiahrt
McHugh	Royce	Toomey
McInnis	Ryan (WI)	Trafficant
McIntosh	Ryun (KS)	Upton
McIntyre	Salmon	Vitter
McKeon	Sanchez	Walden
Metcalfe	Sandin	Wamp
Mica	Sanford	Watts (OK)
Miller (FL)	Saxton	Weldon (FL)
Miller, Gary	Scarborough	Weldon (PA)
Moran (KS)	Schaffer	Weller
Myrick	Sensenbrenner	Whitfield
Nethercutt	Sessions	Wicker
Ney	Shadegg	Wilson
Northup	Shays	Wolf
Norwood	Sherman	Young (AK)
Nussle	Sherwood	Young (FL)

NAYS—192

Abercrombie	Frank (MA)	Meehan
Ackerman	Frost	Meek (FL)
Allen	Gejdenson	Meeks (NY)
Baca	Gillmor	Menendez
Baird	Gonzalez	Millender-
Baldacci	Gutierrez	McDonald
Baldwin	Hall (OH)	Miller, George
Barrett (WI)	Hastings (FL)	Minge
Bateman	Hill (IN)	Mink
Becerra	Hill (MT)	Moakley
Bentsen	Hilliard	Mollohan
Bereuter	Hinchey	Moore
Berman	Hinojosa	Moran (VA)
Blagojevich	Hoeffel	Morella
Blumenauer	Holden	Murtha
Boehlert	Holt	Nadler
Bonior	Hooley	Napolitano
Borski	Hostettler	Neal
Boucher	Hoyer	Oberstar
Boyd	Hyde	Obey
Brady (PA)	Inslee	Olver
Brown (FL)	Jackson (IL)	Ortiz
Brown (OH)	Jackson-Lee	Owens
Campbell	(TX)	Pascarella
Capps	Jefferson	Pastor
Capuano	Johnson (CT)	Payne
Cardin	Johnson, E. B.	Pelosi
Carson	Jones (OH)	Peterson (MN)
Clay	Kanjorski	Phelps
Clayton	Kennedy	Pickett
Clement	Kildee	Pomeroy
Clyburn	Kilpatrick	Porter
Conyers	Kind (WI)	Price (NC)
Costello	Klecza	Rahall
Coyne	Klink	Rangel
Crowley	Kucinich	Reyes
Davis (FL)	LaFalce	Rivers
Davis (IL)	Lampson	Rodriguez
DeFazio	Lantos	Rothman
Delahunt	Larson	Roybal-Allard
DeLauro	Lee	Rush
Deutsch	Levin	Sabo
Dicks	Lewis (GA)	Sanders
Dingell	Lipinski	Sawyer
Doggett	Lofgren	Schakowsky
Dooley	Lowey	Scott
Doyle	Luther	Serrano
Dreier	Maloney (NY)	Shaw
Edwards	Markey	Siskis
Engel	Mascara	Slaughter
Eshoo	Matsui	Smith (WA)
Evans	McCarthy (MO)	Snyder
Farr	McDermott	Spratt
Fattah	McGovern	Stabenow
Filner	McKinney	Stark
Ford	McNulty	Stenholm

Strickland	Turner	Waxman
Stupak	Udall (CO)	Weiner
Tanner	Udall (NM)	Wexler
Tauscher	Velazquez	Weygand
Thompson (CA)	Vento	Wise
Thompson (MS)	Visclosky	Woolsey
Thurman	Walsh	Wu
Tierney	Waters	Wynn
Towns	Watt (NC)	

NOT VOTING—8

Cook	Dixon	Kaptur
Cummings	Gephardt	Watkins
DeGette	Houghton	

1326

Mr. OLVER changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. MANZULLO changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So (two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof) the joint resolution was not passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 119, I was on the floor and pressed the "yea" button, but I was not recorded.

I would like to be recorded as a "yea."

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2328, THE CLEAN LAKES PROGRAM

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 468 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 468

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2328) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to reauthorize the Clean Lakes Program. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure now printed in the bill. Each section of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. Points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute for failure to comply with clause 7 of rule XVI are waived. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum

time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be 15 minutes. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

1330

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mrs. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of the resolution, all time is yielded for the purpose of debate only.

(Mr. REYNOLDS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 468 is an open rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 2328, a bill to reauthorize the Clean Lakes Program. The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. The rule also makes in order the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure amendment in the nature of a substitute now printed in the bill as an original bill for the purpose of an amendment.

The rule waives clause 7 of rule XVI, prohibiting nongermane amendments against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute and provides that the amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be open for amendment by section. Additionally, the rule authorizes the chairman of the Committee of the Whole to accord priority in recognition to Members who have preprinted their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and to postpone votes during consideration of the bill and to reduce voting time to 5 minutes on a postponed question if the vote follows a 15-minute vote.

Finally, the rule provides for one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, the Clean Lakes Program was included in the 1972 amendments to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, commonly referred to as the Clean Water Act. This broad-based program helps communities to address a wide range of water quality issues and helps States through grants and technical assistance.

Reauthorization of the Clean Lakes Program is a necessary measure that will provide much-needed financial and technical assistance to States to restore publicly owned lakes. It is important to note that this is the primary Federal program that places the national focus and priority on lakes, their monitoring, protection, and management.

Mr. Speaker, the funding authorization for this program expired in fiscal year 1990. The program has not received funding since fiscal year 1995. Recently, the EPA has recognized the need to focus on clean lakes activities and has encouraged States to set aside monies from other programs to fund the Clean Lakes Program. In addition, various public and private organizations involved in lake water quality management have been seeking an increase in funding for this program.

Over the past two decades, lake restoration techniques have improved dramatically, and are viewed by many as an important component in meeting the Clean Water Act's objective of having all our Nation's waters fishable and swimmable, including the 41 million acres of fresh water lakes.

One of the most damaging contributing factors to the toxicity of these lakes in the Northeast is acid rain. Not only is it a costly problem to solve, but it can overwhelm State budgets. Funding the Clean Lakes Program is necessary to meet the States' needs in combatting the devastating effects of acid rain and other environmental pollutants.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, this legislation provides the opportunity for necessary partnerships among Federal, State, and local entities to focus both on the prevention and the remediation of pollution. Working together, Federal, State, and local governments can focus attention and resources on the special needs of our Nation's lakes.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY), the bill's sponsor, for his hard work on this measure. In addition, I would like to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), the chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the ranking member, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR.)

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support both this rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from New York for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the open rule. I would note that the underlying bill is noncontroversial and reauthorizes the Clean Lakes Program established under the Clean Water Act.

This measure provides financial and technical assistance to States to restore publicly owned lakes. This is the

primary Federal program that focuses national attention on lakes, their monitoring, protection, and management.

I was pleased that the committee selected two lakes in upstate New York, Otsego Lake and Lake Oneida, to receive priority consideration for demonstration projects in this bill.

Otsego Lake in New York is at the headwaters of the Susquehanna River, the largest single fresh water source for the Chesapeake Bay. Otsego Lake is biologically unique in that deep water oxygen concentrations provide habitat for cold water fisheries, such as lake trout, Atlantic salmon, brown trout, whitefish, and cisco, which are now in jeopardy because of the sustained loss of bottom oxygen in the late summer and fall.

Oneida Lake in New York is the largest inland lake in the State and home to 74 species of fish. The lake watershed covers five counties and more than 800,000 acres. This lake is experiencing water quality problems and its use has been impaired. There are significant concerns regarding sediment and nutrient runoff to the lake from tributaries and agriculture and urban land use trends. In addition, algae, rooted vegetation, and invasive species are problems for this lake.

Again, Mr. Speaker, this is a completely noncontroversial measure; and I do not oppose this open rule.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this open and fair rule.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further request for time, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3039, CHESAPEAKE BAY RESTORATION ACT OF 1999

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 470 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 470

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3039) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to assist in the restoration of the Chesapeake Bay, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule.

The bill shall be considered as read. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be 15 minutes. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

(Mr. REYNOLDS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous material.)

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 470 is an open rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 3039, a bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to assist in the restoration of the Chesapeake Bay. The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Mr. Speaker, the rule also provides that the bill shall be open for amendment at any point, and authorizes the Chair to accord priority in recognition to Members who have preprinted their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Additionally, the rule allows the chairman of the Committee of the Whole to postpone votes during consideration of the bill and to reduce voting time to 5 minutes on a postponed question if the rule follows a 15 minute vote.

Finally, the rule provides for one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, the Chesapeake Bay is the largest estuary in the United States and is an important commercial, recreational, and historical center for thousands of residents in Virginia, Maryland, Pennsylvania, and the District of Columbia.

The Chesapeake Bay is protected and promoted under a unique voluntary partnership under the Chesapeake Bay

Agreement, first adopted in 1983. The signatories to the agreement are the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, the Chesapeake Bay Commission, and the States of Virginia, Pennsylvania, and Maryland, along with the District of Columbia. The agreement directs and conducts the restoration of the Chesapeake Bay.

Over the past two decades, much progress has been made in restoring the Chesapeake Bay. Area wildlife is recovering, toxic pollutant releases are down, and bay grasses have increased. However, much more needs to be done, particularly regarding water clarity and restoring the oyster population.

This bill addresses the need for a cooperative Federal, State, and local effort in restoring the Chesapeake Bay by authorizing \$180 million for the Chesapeake Bay Program for fiscal years 2000 through 2005. In addition, the bill requires Federal facilities to participate in watershed planning and restoration activities.

Finally, the bill requires a study of the state of the Chesapeake Bay ecosystem and a study of the Chesapeake Bay Program's effect on this ecosystem.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support both the rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, this is an open rule. The debate time will be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member on the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. The rule permits amendments under the 5-minute rule.

This is the normal amending process in the House. All Members on both sides of the aisle will have the opportunity to offer germane amendments.

Mr. Speaker, the Chesapeake Bay is one of the most important bodies of water within the United States. Activities in the Bay make significant contributions to our economy through commercial fishing and shipping. The Bay supports extensive wildlife and vegetation. It also provides Americans with numerous recreational opportunities.

Years of man-made pollution have threatened the Bay and the life within it. However, there has been progress, and it is being made under the Chesapeake Bay Agreement signed by the District of Columbia, the Chesapeake Bay Commission, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and the States of Virginia, Maryland, and Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3039 will authorize money over a 6-year period for the United States Federal Government to support the agreement. The Chesapeake Bay is a national treasure. The legislation is necessary to help protect

the Bay and its resources for all Americans. This is an open rule, we support it, and we urge its adoption.

1345

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILLMOR). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the resolution.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE CLEAN LAKES PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALDEN of Oregon). Pursuant to House Resolution 468 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2328.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2328) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to reauthorize the Clean Lakes Program, with Mr. GILLMOR in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER).

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, first of all, perhaps most importantly, I want to commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY) for his leadership in being the principal architect and author of this legislation to reauthorize and improve the Clean Lakes Program.

This bill will help restore and protect our Nation's 41 million acres of fresh water lakes by reauthorizing the EPA Clean Lakes Program. The bill authorizes \$250 million of grants to help States clean up their lakes, and it increases to \$25 million the amount to help States mitigate against the harmful effects of acid mine drainage and acid rain.

The EPA no longer requests funding under the Clean Lakes Program, and has forced the States to stretch their limited nonpoint source funds to clean up their lakes. This legislation restores this important program and places a national focus and a priority on our lakes. It allows funds to solve the wide range of problems impairing our many

lakes. Very importantly, Mr. Chairman, it relies on locally-based solutions involving restoration, rather than new Federal regulations.

I certainly want to thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BORSKI), and the entire committee for their support in moving this environmental legislation forward. It passed the subcommittee and the full committee unanimously by voice vote. I know of no opposition to it.

I would certainly urge overwhelming support for this important environmental legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2328, to reauthorize the Clean Lakes Program. I want to express my appreciation to our chairman for his support of this initiative and for launching the hearings directing the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), to move ahead with this legislation, which is a derivative of and an extension of the monumental Clean Water Act of 1972.

That legislation, which I had the privilege to participate in as a member or administrator of the staff of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation at the time, was then, as it still is, one of the most far-reaching and successful environmental laws Congress has ever enacted.

We have made a lot of progress over the years with the Clean Water Act. It is going on 30 years. One of the reasons is the collaborative partnerships that the act established between the States and the Federal Government to restore and maintain, as the opening directive of that act provides, restore and maintain the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of the Nation's waters.

We have not quite reached the objective of swimmable and fishable in all of the Nation's waters, but we are moving in the right direction.

Section 314 of that act established the Clean Lakes Program. That program directs EPA to work with the States to identify and implement programs to control, reduce, and mitigate levels of pollution in the Nation's lakes.

It has been a valuable resource to reduce pollution. We have funded approximately \$145 million of grant activities since 1945 in 49 States and 18 Indian tribes, 700 individual site assessments, restoration, and implementation projects. But it is only a start.

The most recent national water quality inventory shows that States have reported that only 40 percent of lake acreage across this country has been assessed to determine whether the lakes meet the designated uses. Of that

number, 40 percent are still impaired in some fashion. That means that 30 million acres of lakes across this country have a significant likelihood that the waters are not safe for fishing, swimming, or to support aquatic life in the lake and in the surrounding basin.

Body contact sports was one of the principal objectives of the Clean Water Act of 1972, so people could indeed use the lakes: swim, fish, walk through the lake waters on the edge, as we do with small children in Minnesota and elsewhere across this country. But we have not attained that objective.

This bill will help move us in that direction. It reauthorizes the Clean Lakes Program through 2005. It increases significantly the level of funding to \$50 million a year. The funding would be directed to the States to diagnose the current condition of individual lakes and their watershed, to determine the extent and source of pollution, to develop lake restoration and protection plans that can actually be implemented, not just ideas and studies that remain on a shelf and gather dust, but plans that can actually be implemented.

Secondly, to address the concern of acidity in lake levels, in lakes across this country, we provide authorization for programs aimed at restoring lake water quality and mitigating the harmful effects of lake acidity. Canada actually was ahead of the United States in addressing the problem of acid rain.

Sweden was ahead of Canada. It was in the mid-1970s that Swedish scientists examined lakes that were in the early stages of death, death from acid rain coming from the Ruhr Valley in Germany, traveling over a thousand miles and being deposited on Swedish lakes that soon became clear, so clear you could see right to the bottom, no fish, no plant life. Dead lakes.

We were slow to assess that problem and appreciate the United States. Canada caught on first because the prevailing winds carry acid depositions from the United States north into Canada. Canada mounted a massive counterattack on acid rain problems, and that led to the U.S.-Canada Air Quality Agreement, in addition to the U.S.-Canada Great Lakes Quality Agreement, that has resulted in restoration in lakes in Canada that were nearing the death levels of lakes in Sweden.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation will move us further along in the United States, in the direction of addressing the problems of the harmful effects of acid rain and high lake water acidity. This legislation also adds four lakes to the priority demonstration projects included in the Clean Lakes Program, one of which is Swan Lake, which is in my district, which is of tremendous regional significance for the people living in the iron ore mining country; a 100-square-mile lake in Itasca County that includes the City of Nashwauk, northeast of that lake, there are a wide

range of recreational activities very popular there in the 5 months or 6 months that we can actually enjoy lake activities when they are not frozen over in Minnesota, boating, fishing; significant economic benefit to the entire region.

Mr. Chairman, the water quality has deteriorated over the years, poor soil surrounding the lake and poor lake edge protection and watershed protection, as well as sewage into that lake. We will be able to address this problem and learn from it and apply its lessons elsewhere across the country and across, of course, my own State of 10,000 lakes, which really is about 15,000, actually more than that. We do not really count lakes under 200 acres.

Mr. Chairman, I am really delighted; and I wanted to compliment the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman SHUSTER) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), our subcommittee chairman, for their support and also the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BORSKI), who does not have as many lakes in his district, but who has been very generous in giving his strong support for this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment.

(Mr. BOEHLERT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 2328 reauthorizes the Clean Lakes Program, and we have one person in this Chamber to thank most for that action and that is our colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY). The gentleman deserves to be commended for the leadership he provided.

This is an example of how the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure serves this institution and this Nation so well. We worked out any differences we had in a bipartisan way and are marching forward together.

Mr. Chairman, let me point out that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure under the leadership of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman SHUSTER) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the ranking member, are responsible for more legislation, more successful legislation in this Congress than in the preceding Congress, of greater significance than any other committee of this institution. I am very proud to identify with the committee.

Let me say, unfortunately, that the Environmental Protection Agency has not requested funding for the Clean Lakes Program and the program has not received separate appropriations in recent years. Instead, States have been encouraged to fund clean lakes activities by using funds provided under section 319 of the Clean Water Act for already underfunded nonpoint source programs.

Mr. Chairman, acting to reauthorize this program will send a clear message that we care about restoring and protecting our Nation's 41 million acres of fresh-water lakes for our children and their children. Congress is not the only voice calling for this program. Various public and private organizations involved in lake water quality management had been seeking an increase in funding for the Clean Lakes Program.

This program is seen as an important component of meeting the Clean Water Act's objective of having all our Nation's waters fishable and swimmable. In addition, there is growing concern about the damaging effects of acid rain and acid mine drainage on the Nation's lake. Separate, adequate and consistent funding for the Clean Lakes Program is necessary to meet the needs of the States' lake program.

The Clean Lake Program offers an excellent opportunity for watershed-based community-driven projects, as well as needed partnerships among Federal, State, and local entities. It is a good program. It deserves our enthusiastic support for all the right reasons.

Let me once again commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY) for the leadership he has provided, and let me once again proudly associate with my colleagues on the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure for doing the deed today.

Let me leave with this thought from Henry David Thoreau who said in *Walden* back in 1854: "A lake is the landscape's most beautiful and expressive feature. It is earth's eye: looking into which the beholder measures the depth of his own nature."

1400

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BORSKI), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment.

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) for yielding me this time and also to thank him for his leadership on this issue and so many issues that come before the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

I also want to commend our subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), and our full committee chairman, my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), for working with us in a bipartisan manner which is, of course, the way this committee always works; and again I would add that is why we are so successful.

I also want to commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY), the author of this bill, for pushing and shoving and making sure this piece of legislation comes before us.

Mr. Chairman, I want to rise in strong support of H.R. 2328, a bill to reauthorize the Environmental Protection Agency's Clean Lakes program. The Clean Lakes program was enacted

in 1972 with the passage of the Clean Water Act, to provide additional funding to assess and control pollution levels in our Nation's lakes.

This program has served as a valuable resource for States to identify the sources of pollution, as well as to develop and implement programs aimed at reducing pollution levels in and restoring the quality of lake systems.

The bill we are considering would reauthorize the Clean Lakes program, providing up to \$50 million annually through 2005.

In addition, in order to address the persistent problems of high acidity in our Nation's lakes, this legislation would increase the authorization for programs aimed at reducing the levels of toxins present in these water bodies.

Funding under this program could be used in developing new and innovative methods of neutralizing and restoring the natural buffering capacity of lakes, as well as other methods for removing toxic metals and other substances mobilized by high acidity.

Finally, H.R. 2328 would add four additional lakes to the list of priority demonstration projects authorized under the Clean Lakes program.

These lakes have been identified by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure as regionally significant and deserving of additional attention under this program.

Mr. Chairman, I urge an aye vote on this legislation. I again want to thank the distinguished ranking member, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), for yielding me this time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY), the principal author of this legislation.

(Mr. SWEENEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, I first want to start by thanking my chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman SHUSTER), from the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure for providing the great leadership, the great management skills and guidance throughout all of the dealings in the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure; as well as the ranking member, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR); the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BORSKI), the ranking member on the subcommittee.

When I came to Congress a year and a half ago, a lot of people said that Republicans and Democrats could not work together; we could not get the people's business done. I think if the American people were to look at the work being done by this Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, they would be incredibly impressed. As a freshman Member of Congress, I know I am and I am thankful. I am thankful because this piece of legislation is being passed today at a very important time.

Recently, Mr. Chairman, the GAO released a study that I had requested on the problem of acid rain in the Adirondack Mountains, which is a region that is consumed by the 22nd Congressional District, which I represent. The results were striking. Many of our lakes in the Adirondacks are increasingly at risk from acid rain, much more than the EPA had originally forecast.

Despite power plant emissions reductions under the 1990 Clean Air Act amendments, nearly half of our lakes have shown an increase in nitrogen levels.

In fact, last year a similar EPA study showed an expansion of the effects of acid rain throughout. However, acid rain is not the only problem that our Nation's lakes are facing. They are facing problems such as invasive species, degraded shorelines, mercury contamination, wetland loss, lake-use conflicts, fisheries imbalances, and nonpoint source pollution, are all threatening our 41 million acres of freshwater lakes.

This is part of the reason why I introduced H.R. 2328, and the other is because my district, as in many parts of the Nation, the lakes are a way of life. They provide a quality of life for the citizens who live near them. Whether it is tourism, drinking water, the natural habitat for many species of birds, fish and other animals, or simply recreation, many communities derive their livelihood from freshwater sources.

Additionally, Mr. Chairman, I should point out that I have been disappointed in the EPA's attempt to shift funding requests under this program to section 319, which deals with nonpoint source pollution management. Our lakes are important enough to qualify and compete with other programs for Federal funding, and that is why we need this reauthorization program today.

I believe this program is something we can all agree on. During its heyday in the 1970s and the 1980s, this program was popular with grass-roots organizations and citizens because it offered them the opportunity to work with Federal, State, and local entities on both prevention and remediation of pollution.

Fundamentally, this program focuses on restoration, not regulation. Some of the past successes included what happened in the State of Florida, when they did an assessment of the 7,000 freshwater lakes to set up a lake management priority system. The grant helped the State prioritize its lakes and their watershed for remedial management programs.

In New York and Vermont they used a grant and teamed up to assess phosphorus pollution in Lake Champlain and set up a plan to monitor the phosphorous load in the lake.

North Dakota used a clean lakes grant to seek correlations between micro-invertebrate communities and the trophic status of lakes.

The results of these grants can help other States that might face similar

problems, and without this program States and their communities will probably not have the resources or technical expertise to conduct studies for themselves.

Mr. Chairman, this is a positive environmental initiative that I think a broad group of philosophies in this House can agree upon. It will provide resources to the most local levels of government to address environmental challenges in our lakes.

Previously, the Clean Lakes program was a uniquely effective, cost-efficient environmental program that provided seed money to State lake programs to projects on public lakes.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all of my colleagues to support this important legislation, and again I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman SHUSTER) for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN).

(Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) for yielding me this time; and the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY) for his leadership; the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) for his leadership.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2328, a bill to reauthorize the Clean Lakes program. This program recognizes the beauty and value of our lakes and the need to protect and restore these wonderful resources. It is high time we reauthorize and fund the Clean Lakes program.

As we know, the Clean Lakes program was established in 1972 as part of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, commonly referred to as the Clean Water Act. The authorization expired in 1990, and the program has not been funded since 1995 when the EPA stopped requesting money to run it.

While the EPA may have stopped requesting money for clean lakes, I have not, since New Jersey has many lakes that need attention and immediate attention. As a member of the Subcommittee on VA, HUD and Independent Agencies, I have consistently supported a separate appropriation for the section 314 program. Perhaps with the passage of this bill, a clean lakes earmark will now be possible at the appropriations level.

As we know, section 319 deals with watershed restoration issues. Section 314 deals with lake monitoring and protection and management issues. Although related, these two issues are different and should not have to compete for limited dollars.

Mr. Chairman, we have had a sad experience in New Jersey where the lumping together of section 314 and section 319 simply has not worked. This bill would move us towards correcting that problem, and I strongly support it.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the very great significance of this legislation is underscored in many of the lakes and the communities throughout Minnesota. We are blessed, as other less fortunate communities across the country would like to be, in that many of our towns have a lake right in the town. Over the years, before the 1960s, before we had a clean water program, many towns just allowed their storm sewers to discharge into the lakes. Many even allowed their sanitary sewers, after primary treatment, to discharge into lakes. Then they began to realize what an important resource the lake is and diverted sewage away from it and diverted street runoff away from the lakes, although many in the northern tier continued to pile up snow from winter storms on the lake. Where else? It seemed sensible. Let it melt, add to the lake's waters. Now we know that there is pollution in winter as well as in summer. Cities now avoid that tragedy inflicted upon the Nation's lakes.

So what we have is many lakes that should be great resources for swimming, for tourism, for boating, for fishing, that have substantial amounts of pollution embedded in the lake bottom. In the sediment under those waters, plants grow up, transmit the pollutants to the fish who feed on the plant life, and then humans consume the fish and in turn find embedded in their body cells the pollutants that we all know are so harmful.

Why is this legislation so important? Because cities can have access to funds to develop plans to clean up those lakes, restore them perhaps not to their pristine original condition created by the glaciers when they retreated 10,000 years ago, but at least to be swimmable, to be fishable, to be usable, to be a community attraction rather than a point of shame for a community.

This legislation will provide States, through States to communities, the resources, financial resources, they need to make their lakes the great treasures that they should be. As the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) so poetically described in the closing words of his remarks on the House Floor, lakes should be the eye through which a community sees itself and sees its treasures.

So I have great hopes for this legislation; and I want to take this opportunity to urge the administration to, in the future, include funding for the Clean Lakes program, which they have not done for several years, and to urge our colleagues on the Committee on Appropriations, it was very encouraging to have the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) address the issue rather directly, that enactment of this legislation will give the Committee on Appropriations an opportunity to provide funding for the Clean Lakes program. That will be the ultimate success of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I urge an aye vote on H.R. 2328, the Clean Lakes program, because it helps restore and protect our Nation's 41 million acres of freshwater lakes. It helps States clean up their lakes, and it mitigates the harmful effects of high acidity like acid rain.

Now, one may ask why is this particular bill, H.R. 2328, needed? It is because of the pollution or habitat degradation that impairs 39 percent of the 17 million acres which have already been surveyed. EPA currently requires States to stretch their limited nonpoint source funds to clean up their lakes. H.R. 2328 restores a national focus and priority on our lakes.

I think it was very instructive, as the distinguished ranking member pointed out, the problem of such things as acid rain and how in Europe acid rain from the Ruhr Valley caused problems all the way up in Sweden.

1415

Certainly here in the United States, acid rain knows no State boundaries. Indeed, that is one of the reasons why we need to have a national program, because certainly acid rain is something that crosses State lines, and the acid rain from one State can very seriously damage the lakes of another State, as has, in fact, been the case.

Now, the background to this program, which was established under section 314 of the Clean Water Act, provides for financial and technical assistance to States in restoring publicly owned lakes. In recognition of the unique water quality challenges, facing our Nation's lakes, Congress included the Clean Lakes Program as part of the original 1972 Clean Water Act.

Section 314 contains various State assessment and reporting requirements, a national demonstration program, and an EPA grant program for assistance to States in carrying out projects and program responsibilities.

On June 23, 1999, the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY) introduced H.R. 2328. This was referred solely to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 2328 would reauthorize funding for the Clean Lakes Program for fiscal years 2000 through 2005, and would increase the authorized annual funding levels from \$30 million to \$100 million.

On October 18, 1999, the Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment held a hearing on Clean Lakes and Water Quality Management and on H.R. 2328. On March 8, 2000, the Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment marked up H.R. 2328.

The subcommittee adopted an amendment in the nature of a substitute. This amendment, A, reduced the funding authorization from \$100 million annually to \$50 million annually; and, B, added additional lakes to the list of lakes to receive priority con-

sideration for demonstration projects; and, C, increased the special authorization of financial assistance to States to mitigate harmful effects of high acidity from acid deposition or acid mine drainage from \$15 million to \$25 million; and, D, prevented the report to Congress on the Clean Lakes Demonstration Program from expiring under the Federal Reports Elimination and Sunset Act of 1995.

The subcommittee reported H.R. 2328, as amended, favorably to the full committee. On March 16, 2000, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure reported the bill as amended by the subcommittee by unanimous voice vote.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire of the Chair how much time remains on each side.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) has 16½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) has 14½ minutes remaining.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN).

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I am very interested in working with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman SHUSTER) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the ranking member, concerning Lake Apopka in Florida.

Florida, as my colleagues know, is one of the third largest States, and Lake Apopka is the second most polluted lake in the State of Florida.

We have been harmed by many years of agricultural storm water discharges, as well as historical discharges of both domestic and industrial waste water. Because of this, this particular lake has been in the news. Many Federal officials have come down, and there is a lot of concern as to how this relates to the community.

I am hoping that the committee will look into Lake Apopka as we move this bill through the process and consider adding this to the list.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, could the gentlewoman from Florida describe for us the size of the lake in acres. Does the gentlewoman from Florida have that information available?

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I do not have it, but I will have that information for the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentlewoman from Florida, are boating activities prevalent on the lake? I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Yes, sir. Mr. Chairman, in fact, I have been in touch with the Water Management District, and they will forward that information.

In reviewing the bill, I was very concerned that Florida was not represented in the bill. Of course this lake is crucial to the State of Florida.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentlewoman from Florida, is it a lake that is used considerably for fishing as well?

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN).

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Fishing, Mr. Chairman. But, as I said, there has been a shift in the usage because of the contamination of the lake.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, but because the lake waters are contaminated, the fish are probably not fit for sustainable human consumption.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will further yield, that is correct. Also, there has been a shift in the vegetation and wildlife in communities around the lake because of the polluted facility.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, this certainly is the type of lake and these are the conditions that this legislation seeks to address. The authority provided in the legislation for grants to States and through States to municipalities is the appropriate venue for the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN) to pursue this matter.

We will certainly, on the committee, be very happy to support the gentlewoman's interest in seeing that there are adequate resources when appropriations are made. There are no appropriations available now. The point of this legislation is to authorize expanded funding through a program from EPA of grants to States and through States to municipalities or other lesser units of government that then will undertake cleanup plans.

It would be useful if the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN) could provide us with any restoration plan that either the city or county or joint powers agreement authority may have developed for the cleanup of this lake and any other supporting information, as the gentlewoman has already indicated. I am sure the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman SHUSTER) will support us in the initiative of appealing to EPA at the appropriate time for consideration of this project.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBERSTAR. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I certainly concur with the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN) and will be very happy to work on this with them to find an adequate and acceptable solution.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield such time as he may

consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY), the principal author of this legislation.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding me the time. I echo the thoughts of the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN) and hope that we can work together in finding a solution.

The beauty of this legislation really is that it provides an opportunity for localities and people in communities to really interact and do some positive proactive work.

I have got a letter here from a Robert Mac Millan, who is the chairman of the Saratoga Lake Protection and Improvement District. I would like to read it because it will give people the sense of the kinds of things and kinds of people that are interested in this.

Dear Congressman SWEENEY:

I am writing to you in support of your Clean Lakes Bill which will be the subject of a legislative hearing.

I am the Chairman of the Saratoga Lake Protection and Improvement District (SLPID). The SLPID was created as political subdivision of New York State in 1986 to supervise, manage, and control Saratoga Lake. Our primary responsibilities are to enhance recreational use of Saratoga Lake, protect real property values, conserve fish and wildlife and enhance the scenic beauty of the Lake. We are funded primarily by a special tax assessment placed by lakefront property owners. This tax assessment was increased 65.9 percent for the tax year 2000 and will still fall short of funding necessary to control all of the actions we need on the Lake.

Saratoga Lake is experiencing a major increase in aquatic weed growth and zebra mussels which adversely affects all aspects of our Lake. One of the most invasive weeds is Eurasian Water Milfoil, a plant not native to North America. Our primary method of weed control has been mechanical harvesting, but we find that harvesting is not accomplishing control of the aquatic weed problem. We have applied for a permit from New York State Department of Environmental Conservation to treat two of the problem areas in the Lake with aquatic herbicide. This treatment will be closely monitored for effectiveness and incorporated in a lake watershed and management plan which is presently ongoing.

I am aware of the Federal Non-indigenous Aquatic Nuisance Prevention and Control Act of 1990 which was to mitigate the financial impact of non-indigenous aquatic species such as Eurasian Water Milfoil and zebra mussels on local governments. Our current effort to control the weed in Saratoga Lake through the use of an EPA and New York State approved herbicide may be an excellent demonstration project which could be useful to other lakes experiencing similar problems with non-native aquatic species. Providing our treatment efforts are successful this year we hope to obtain funding to accomplish a whole lake treatment during 2001.

Mr. Chairman, I read this letter and bring this letter to the floor to point out this will be the norm. This will be the norm that occurs throughout this Nation as we fight to preserve our clean water sources.

This bill being passed today is coming at a crucial time, as I stated before, especially since we have taken many significant steps in the last decade to

reduce the effects of pollutants, especially nitrates and sulfur dioxide throughout. But in some respects, we are losing that battle.

This will provide us a ground-up approach to that effort. This will give us the opportunity for people in the local communities to fight for these valuable resources. I am very proud to be the sponsor of this bill, and I look forward to its implementation.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for a general debate has expired.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill shall be considered by sections as an original bill for the purpose of amendment, and pursuant to the rule, each section is considered read.

During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chair may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment that he has printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered read.

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone a request for a recorded vote on any amendment and may reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the time for voting on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote, provided that the time for voting on the first question shall be a minimum of 15 minutes.

The Clerk will designate section 1.

The text of section 1 is as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. GRANTS TO STATES

Section 314(c)(2) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1324(c)(2)) is amended by striking "\$50,000,000" the first place it appears and all that follows through "1990" and inserting "\$50,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2001 through 2005".

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 1?

There being no amendments to section 1, the Clerk will designate section 2.

The text of section 2 is as follows:

SEC. 2. DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.

Section 314(d) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1324(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2) by inserting "Otsego Lake, New York; Oneida Lake, New York; Raystown Lake, Pennsylvania; Swan Lake, Itasca County, Minnesota;" after Sauk Lake, Minnesota;"

(2) in paragraph (3) by striking "By" and inserting "Notwithstanding section 3003 of the Federal Reports Elimination and Sunset Act of 1995 (31 U.S.C. 1113 note; 109 Stat. 734-736), by"; and

(3) in paragraph (4)(B)(i) by striking "\$15,000,000" and inserting "\$25,000,000".

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 2?

There being no amendments to section 2, are there further amendments to the bill?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STUPAK

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STUPAK:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 3. PROHIBITION OF BULK FRESH WATER SALES FROM GREAT LAKES.

Section 314 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1324) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(e) PROHIBITION OF BULK FRESH WATER SALES FROM GREAT LAKES.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—As a condition of the receipt of grant assistance under this section in a fiscal year, the Administrator shall require a State to provide assurances satisfactory to the Administrator that the State will prohibit in such fiscal year the sale of bulk fresh water from any of the Great Lakes.

"(2) BULK FRESH WATER DEFINED.—The term 'bulk fresh water' means fresh water extracted from any of the Great Lakes in amounts intended for transportation by tanker or similar form of mass transportation, without further processing. The term does not include drinking water in containers intended for personal consumption."

Mr. STUPAK (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment which is very important to the residents in my district and many congressional districts throughout the Great Lakes region.

My amendment would prevent the sale of fresh water from our Great Lakes. Our precious water resources should not be sold to the highest bidder, and we must ensure that this cannot happen.

Our Great Lakes are a tremendous recreational resource. They provide boating, water skiing, fishing, and swimming opportunities. Our lakes are also a tremendous source of drinking water. Most notably, of course, are the Great Lakes, which contain 20 percent of the world's fresh water supply.

The 35 million people residing near the Great Lakes have always appreciated the lakes' beauty, vastness, cleanliness, and now they must appreciate that it is also a targeted commodity.

1430

In 1998, a Canadian company planned to ship 3 billion liters of water from Lake Superior over 5 years and sell it to Asia. I offered legislation that was passed by the House of Representatives that called on the United States Government to oppose this action. The permit was subsequently withdrawn. The demand for water continues, however, as freshwater supplies dwindle throughout the world.

In the United States, each person consumes 100 gallons of water each day. The global demand meanwhile doubles every 21 years. Think about it. The world water demand doubles every 21 years. The World Bank predicts that by 2025 more than 3 billion people in 52 countries will suffer water shortages

for drinking or sanitation. Where, I ask, will countries find clean, fresh water? They will look to alternative sources, sources which are outside their area and, more likely, outside their borders.

It is understandable, therefore, that the pristine water of our Great Lakes will be targeted. The method is real. The threat is real. To those who say the bulk shift of fresh water is not economically feasible, I say, look around us. From Newfoundland in Canada, to Lake Superior in Michigan, to Alaska, several companies are competing to ship our precious freshwater resources overseas.

For those who take a short-term view of protecting this resource, bulk sales of fresh water must seem irresistible. Throw a hose in the water, hook up a pump, and fill an ocean tanker. Maximum profits with minimum overhead. A windfall if a State wanted to license this kind of operation.

Yes, our Great Lakes are renewable; but they are not replaceable. I am very concerned that shortsighted policies could allow for large-scale diversions of Great Lakes water, threatening the environment, the economy, and the welfare of the Great Lakes region.

We are not merely citizens of the Great Lakes. We are their guardians. We are their stewards. We are their protectors. We encourage conservation, and we return 95 percent of all the water taken from the Great Lakes.

Setting aside global water use and trade policies, I ask Members to consider how bulk diversion of Great Lakes water could jeopardize our efforts to be good stewards. In terms of water quality, if we permit bulk diversions to further lower water levels, we increase the concentration of runoff contaminants, of fuel pollution. As lake levels drop, which they are now, we increase the need for dredging to maintain our vital waterways, further compounding the problem with toxic sediments.

We must consider all threats posed to our Great Lakes. We must be conscious of the threat posed by the sale or diversion of Great Lakes water just as carefully as we weigh the impact of the invasive species or drilling for gas and oil in the Great Lakes. None of these concerns are truly independent of one another in terms of their potential impact on the 35 million people who depend on our most vital natural resource, the Great Lakes, our great treasures.

My amendment would withhold grant assistance from Great Lakes States which allow the sale of bulk fresh water from the Great Lakes. This restriction would apply to water extracted from a lake for mass transportation without further processing and does not apply to bottled water used for consumption.

The cleanup of our lakes will preserve their beauty for generations to come. The ban on water sales from our Great Lakes will also preserve their

beauty and our greatest natural resource for generations to come.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I rise not so much in opposition to the concept. In fact, not at all in opposition to the concept. I support very vigorously the idea that the gentleman is trying to advance, but I do not support the vehicle that he has chosen to approach this subject.

The matter of diversion of water from the Great Lakes is an issue of very great concern to those of us who live in this heartland of the United States. The Great Lakes represent 20 percent of all the fresh water on the face of the Earth. Lake Superior represents half of that water. Lake Superior is equal to all the water of the other four Great Lakes. It is a vast resource. The only other lake in the world that approaches the volume and the enormity of Lake Superior is Lake Baikal in Russia.

We have been vigilant, on both the U.S. and the Canadian side, about the water quality, about the volume of water, through the international joint commission; about the rising or falling levels of water in the Great Lakes. We have also been concerned that there may be attempts by water-short areas of the North American continent and water-short areas of other places on the face of the Earth that may have their eyes fixed on the Great Lakes.

Beginning with the coal slurry pipeline in 1970, the eyes of the western States were fixed on the Great Lakes, admittedly under the guise of selling low sulfur coal in an economical transport means of pipeline to the lakehead in Duluth, where then it could be transferred to tankers for lower lake port power plants. But those of us who maintain vigil on the shores of Gitche Gumee said this also has the capacity of draining the water out of the lakes. They could reverse those pumps. Once they are that close to Lake Superior, they could just drop a pump in the lake and start shipping the water westward. We vigorously opposed and ultimately stopped the coal slurry pipeline.

In 1986, in furtherance of this concern, I offered an amendment in committee in the Water Resources Development Act, in cooperation with Democrats and Republicans throughout the Great Lakes States, to require, before any water could be diverted out of any of the Great Lakes, unanimous consent of the governors of the Great Lakes States and, though we could not bind, the province of Ontario. That province is so vast it covers all five of the Great Lakes. And we succeeded in getting that language enacted. It has been successful until very recently in scaring off potential diverters.

Then, in 1998, a Canadian company based in the Province of Ontario got up the idea of selling, in bulk means, water from Lake Ontario to overseas sources. An immediate outcry rose in

the Province and, of course, on the U.S. side of the Great Lakes that resulted in the Province of Ontario denying a permit to withdraw water. But the potential remains for withdrawing water from one of the Great Lakes and bottling it in little containers. And if it can be bottled in pint and quart and gallon and 5 gallon sizes, then what is to prevent someone from shipping it in larger containers of 5,000 or 10,000 gallons or more?

So the concern of my good friend, who maintains a watchful eye from his northern peninsula, upper peninsula, a Michigan outpost, on the lake is well placed and fully founded and justified.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. OBERSTAR was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. OBERSTAR. So I compliment the gentleman, Mr. Chairman, on his vigilance on this matter, but I feel that the vehicle is not appropriate. It has, first of all, not had widespread scrutiny in our committee. We have not had an opportunity until just now to review the approach the gentleman takes.

It has been my intention that, in cooperation with the gentleman from Michigan and others of our colleagues in the Great Lakes States, to approach this subject in the forthcoming Water Resources Development Act of 2000.

I would like to ask my colleague if he would consider withdrawing the amendment, preserving the option and, of course, protecting his right to come forth in the WRDA bill and to cooperate with us in a similar venture.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBERSTAR. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for yielding. If there is going to be a WRDA bill, that is the first if. Secondly, if we will be given an opportunity to offer the amendment.

We have a bill; it is 2595. As the gentleman knows, the International Joint Commission on February 22 put forth their recommendations on what should be done to not only stop vast transfers of water out of the Great Lakes region but also what should be in the meantime to make sure the States provide the necessary data and information so we can make intelligent decisions concerning our water resources. Not just for transfer or sale but also for the ecology of it, for the environment, and for the conservation.

So if we would have a WRDA bill, and if we were to be given the opportunity to appear before the committee to present H.R. 2595, my bill on the Great Lakes, or a modified version taking in the International Joint Commission's recommendations, I would be willing to entertain that.

I see we probably have a number of more speakers, so I would like to hear the other speakers before I withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) has once again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. OBERSTAR was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, if I might inquire of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) regarding the formulation. I think we may be at the end of hearings, or there may be an opportunity for further hearings on the WRDA bill, but it is my understanding that the chair of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure intends to proceed with a WRDA bill for 2000.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBERSTAR. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, it is certainly our intention to move the WRDA bill this year, WRDA 2000. The administration just sent their bill up, so we will be dealing with it.

And I would say to my good friend from Michigan that we certainly want to work with him. I do not think this is the appropriate vehicle. The WRDA bill would seem to be more appropriate.

We just received this amendment, literally handed to us. So while we are aware of the basic issue the gentleman is attempting to address, which is complex and which is very important, we are quite happy to work with the gentleman to see if we cannot accommodate him on a more appropriate vehicle, such as the WRDA bill or another related piece of legislation.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, it does seem to me that WRDA is the appropriate vehicle, and I further yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. STUPAK. The few times I have done bills on Great Lakes to preserve and protect the Great Lakes, they have been bipartisan bills. I would like to remain in that bipartisan atmosphere. At times, it gets a little difficult, when we have people outside the Great Lakes coming into our region and our districts and making wild statements about our lack of protection of the Great Lakes. So we are always vigilant to look for opportunities to protect our Great Lakes and our Great Lakes resources.

As long as I am a Member of Congress, I will continue to work day in and day out to protect the Great Lakes. Based upon the assurances from the chairman and the ranking member, however, I will look forward to working with both the chairman and the ranking member to work to protect the Great Lakes in the WRDA bill, WRDA 2000.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for his leadership on this issue, for his vigilance, his concern, and for his statesmanship in making this unanimous consent request. And I want to assure the gen-

tleman that we will work very closely and very diligently toward his objective.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment is withdrawn.

Are there further amendments to the bill?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TRAFICANT:

At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. —. SENSE OF CONGRESS; REQUIREMENT REGARDING NOTICE.

(a) PURCHASE OF AMERICAN-MADE EQUIPMENT AND PRODUCTS.—In the case of any equipment or products that may be authorized to be purchased with financial assistance provided under this Act, it is the sense of the Congress that entities receiving such assistance should, in expending the assistance, purchase only American-made equipment and products.

(b) NOTICE TO RECIPIENTS OF ASSISTANCE.—In providing financial assistance under this Act, the head of each Federal agency shall provide to each recipient of the assistance a notice describing the statement made in subsection (a) by the Congress.

(c) NOTICE OF REPORT.—Any entity which receives funds under this Act shall report any expenditures on foreign-made items to the Congress within 180 days of the expenditure.

Mr. TRAFICANT (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, we do not know what this amendment is, have not seen it or heard about it, have not smelled it. This is a surprise.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, this is a standard Buy American amendment that has been added to every transportation bill that we have offered.

1445

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) has an amendment to this bill at the desk.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Yes, I do, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object. May we have a copy of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will re-report the amendment.

The Clerk rereported the amendment.

Mr. TRAFICANT (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) has reserved a point of order.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to notify the committee that I did bring this to the floor earlier this morning but I have been testifying before the Committee on Ways and Means and would have apprised the leadership of it. But it is an amendment that has been passed to every probation bill and every authorizing bill that involves the expenditures of funds. It has not been a controversial bill in the past. I do not believe it should be at this point.

In any event, it encourages the purchases of American-made products. Anyone who gets assistance under the bill shall get a notice of Congress intention to urge them, wherever possible, to buy American-made products.

Finally, anyone who is getting these funds give us a report back when they spend the money how they spend that money.

Now, we are running about a \$300 billion trade deficit. I think if we are going to go ahead and spend money for goods and services that those goods and services, wherever possible, should be American goods and services.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRAFICANT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to withdraw my point of order. Having had the opportunity now to see the amendment, it is a buy-American amendment, which I have vigorously supported in the past and am happy to support today.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments of the gentleman, and I apologize to both gentleman from having not been here to explain it to them earlier.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRAFICANT. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT), of course we have had buy-American provisions in other legislation of this committee. But the Part B of the sense of Congress, does the notice to recipients in Part B flow from the sentence in the previous subsection (a), that is, the sense of Congress, so that Part B is also a sense of Congress and not a requirement in law that, in providing financial assistance, the head of each agency shall provide a notice?

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, section (b) states that, even though it is the sense of the Congress that they are not mandated to buy American, section (b) mandates that the agency shall at least make notice that the Congress encourages the purchase of American products.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield,

the sense of Congress language terminates with subsection (a) but subsection (b) is a requirement upon Federal agencies to provide notice.

Mr. Chairman, may I inquire of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), is that the understanding of the chairman?

Part B of the Buy-American provision is a requirement upon Federal agencies providing assistance to provide a notice and to report.

Mr. Chairman, is that consistent with the understanding of the chairman? I just want to make this clear.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRAFICANT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I guess that is what the language says. There might be a technical problem with some of the language which we would have to work out in conference here.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time to clarify the concern of the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the Congress urges the recipients of this money to buy American, but the Congress also requires those agencies that give the money to give them a notice that Congress does encourage them to buy.

They are not compelled to buy, but what they are compelled to give is a notice and give us a report on the activity.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, is it his understanding that this applies only to the legislation before us today?

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, absolutely, to this specific bill and this bill alone. I will have another amendment for his next bill very similar.

Mr. Chairman, I urge an "aye" vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there other amendments?

If not, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CAMP) having assumed the chair, Mr. GILLMOR, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2328) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to reauthorize the Clean Lakes Program, pursuant to House Resolution 468, reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on the amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

CHESAPEAKE BAY RESTORATION ACT OF 1999

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 470 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 3039.

1454

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3039) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to assist in the restoration of the Chesapeake Bay, and for other purposes, with Mr. GILLMOR in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER).

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly want to commend the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BATEMAN) for his leadership on this legislation that is going to help protect one of our national treasures, the Chesapeake Bay.

The Bay has a 64,000 square mile watershed and is home to over 15 million people and more than 3,000 plant and animal species. Bay restoration efforts are working well. Striped bass, underwater grasses are back, toxic releases are down, more than 67 percent since 1988 in fact, and the nutrients have been reduced.

However, parts of the Bay remain impaired. This legislation will strengthen

cooperative efforts to address the remaining work to be done to restore and to protect the Bay.

I would emphasize that this legislation passed the subcommittee and the full committee unanimously by a voice vote, and I know of no controversy.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly support H.R. 3039, the Chesapeake Bay Restoration Act. The Chesapeake Bay is one of the great estuaries of the world, perhaps the greatest, the meeting place of salt and fresh water where new forms of life are created.

Those forms of life, whether new forms or existing ones, are increasingly endangered in the world's estuaries by the pollution that we discharge into the waters and into the meeting places.

In 1983, the Federal Government and the States of Virginia, Maryland, Pennsylvania, as well as the District of Columbia, signed the first Chesapeake Bay Agreement. Four years later, the Federal Government and the Bay States and the communities within them reached agreement on the problems facing the Bay, the shared responsibility for deteriorating conditions, and on the joint actions that were needed to slow and reverse the destruction of this resource.

In the past 17 years, the hard work of all those involved is beginning to bear fruit. The Bay is showing signs of improvement. But the work is never over.

This legislation will take a further step toward improvement of water quality and improvement of the overall health of the Bay ecosystem.

The legislation will reauthorize the Environmental Protection Agency's successful Chesapeake Bay Program for an additional 6 years, giving stability and strength to this very important initiative. It will increase the program funding level. The Program Office of EPA has been very successful in working collaboratively with the States and the communities adjacent to the Bay in identifying causes of pollution, building partnerships to restore the health of that enormous resource.

Under this legislation, EPA will continue the cooperative collaborative approach of developing interstate management plans, control harmful nutrients, control the addition of toxins to improve water quality, and restore habitats to the ecosystem.

In addition, the legislation will incorporate into the Chesapeake Bay Agreement those improvements jointly recommended by the participating States, including recommendations for the administrator and authority for the administrator to approve small watershed grants to fund local governments and nonprofit organizations for local protection and restoration programs.

If we do not address the health of the Bay by including the watersheds that

drain into that Bay, we have not accomplished the purpose of preserving, restoring, and enhancing the quality of the waters of the Bay. That, I think, is the most important feature of this legislation, that it deals with the watershed and not just with the discharge points.

I strongly support the legislation and urge an "aye" vote.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Water Resources and Development.

(Mr. BOEHLERT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for once again providing, along with the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the ranking member, leadership on the full committee. I want to express my deep appreciation to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BORSKI), the ranking member of our Subcommittee on Water Resources and Development.

Once again, this is time to highlight something that needs to be highlighted. We do not do it often enough. I know we do it in the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. We do a lot of things exceptionally well. But we have the best professional staff anywhere on the Hill or in any governmental unit and they deserve a lot of praise.

1500

I will defer to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BATEMAN) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST), people who live in the zone who are just married to the Chesapeake Bay and who know so well the importance of that great resource and what we need to do to make certain we move forward to restore it.

With that, let me thank all who have been partners to this venture. We have come a long way. We have got further to go. We are going to get there together.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BORSKI), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment, who has maintained a vigilant eye on the bay and on the water quality thereof.

(Mr. BORSKI asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Chairman, let me first thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I rise in strong support of H.R. 3039, the Chesapeake Bay Restoration Act of 1999. This legislation would reauthorize the successful Chesapeake Bay program for an additional 6 years. This program, operating with the Environmental Protection Agency, has been very effective at protecting and restoring

the Chesapeake Bay ecosystem through workable partnerships among the Federal Government, the District of Columbia, and the States surrounding the bay watershed. I also want to acknowledge, Mr. Chairman, the outstanding work of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BATEMAN) in developing and pursuing this legislation.

H.R. 3039 builds upon the success of the Chesapeake Bay program by incorporating within it several improvements which have been recommended by the Federal Government and the other signers of the 1987 Chesapeake Bay agreement: Virginia, Maryland, the District of Columbia, and my home State of Pennsylvania. Included within this bill is authority for a new small watershed grants program. Funding for this new program would be available to local governmental and nonprofit organizations as well as individuals in the Chesapeake Bay region to implement local protection and restoration programs in the watershed to improve water quality and create, restore or enhance habitat within the ecosystem. Mr. Chairman, the Chesapeake Bay is a national treasure struggling toward restoration. This legislation will add greatly in that restoration. I urge an aye vote on this legislation.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BATEMAN), the principal author of this legislation.

Mr. BATEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding me this time. I would like to say to him and to the ranking member and to all those who have addressed this subject matter today that I am proud to have lived near the shores of the Chesapeake Bay all but 5 years of my life. It is a very dear part of the world. I am proud to have been associated with the creation of the original Chesapeake Bay program and its original authorization and my role in convincing the then Reagan administration that it should be the bellwether of their environmental program, which even deserved mention in the President's State of the Union address.

The Chesapeake Bay program is the unique regional partnership that has been coordinating the restoration of the Chesapeake Bay since the signing of the historic 1983 Chesapeake Bay agreement. As the largest estuary in the United States and one of the most productive in the world, the Chesapeake Bay was the Nation's first estuary targeted for restoration and protection. The Chesapeake Bay program evolved as the means to restore this exceptionally valuable resource. H.R. 3039 will continue the cooperative Federal, State, and local efforts that already have successfully achieved progress restoring the bay.

Since its inception in 1983, the bay program's highest priority has been restoration of the bay's living resources. Improvements include fisheries and habitat restoration, recovery

of bay grasses, nutrient and toxic reductions, and significant advances in estuarine science. However, parts of the bay remain impaired. Nutrients are still too high, oyster populations have been in severe decline, and water clarity still has a great deal that needs to be done to improve it. By passing H.R. 3039, the House will declare its commitment to saving the bay.

The Chesapeake Bay program has not been reauthorized since the expiration of the Clean Water Act of which it was a component. Although the program has continued to receive funding annually since then, it is important that the Congress express its continued support for the cleanup and preservation of the Chesapeake Bay. The Chesapeake Bay Restoration Act would do just that, reauthorizing the program from 2000 to 2005. In addition, the bill requires the submission of reports both to the Congress and the public describing the activities funded by the program and its accomplishments.

The Chesapeake Bay is one of the most vital natural resources in the United States. Please join me in supporting the enhancement of a program that has done so much to preserve this wonderful resource.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), who has been a vigilant participant in protecting the resources of the bay. I am grateful for his leadership.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Chairman, let me thank the gentleman from Minnesota for yielding me this time, but more importantly let me thank the leadership on both sides of the aisle for bringing forward this very, very important bill. I think we all can be very proud of what we have been able to do in the Chesapeake Bay, the Federal Government being one of the major partners. I particularly want to acknowledge the work that the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BATEMAN) has done over his entire congressional career on the Chesapeake Bay.

The constituents of my district and in Maryland, indeed the entire Nation, are very much gratified by what we have been able to accomplish through the leadership here in Congress. I see the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST) who has been another one of the real leaders on the Chesapeake Bay issues. This has been one of the largest voluntary multijurisdictional water quality and living resource restoration programs in the history of our Nation, and it has been a model program that we can now use in many other multijurisdictional bodies of water.

I was Speaker of the House in Maryland in 1983 when Governor Hughes on behalf of the State of Maryland joined with the governors of Virginia and Pennsylvania and the mayor of Washington and the administrator of EPA and signed a one-page 1983 agreement that started the Chesapeake Bay Restoration program with a Federal partnership. It has been a partnership of

government, the Federal, State and local; it has been a partnership between government and the private sector; and it has worked.

We set one of the most ambitious goals for reducing pollutants in nitrogen and in phosphorus by 40 percent by this year. Mr. Chairman, we have come very close to meeting those goals in a watershed the size of 64,000 square miles. We have never attempted such a broad program in the past. I think we all can be proud. This reauthorization bill not only reauthorizes but expands it, increases the Federal Government's partnership in this effort, which gives us great hope for the future.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBERSTAR. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Chairman, I had intended to offer an amendment requiring the administrator to commence a 3-year study to develop model water quality and living resource improvement strategies for areas impacted by development using work currently under way in the Patapsco/Back River tributary in the Baltimore, Maryland, metropolitan area. My amendment would have specified that the administrator's study, conducted with the full participation of local governments, watershed organizations, and interested groups, develop a coordinated mechanism and make various determinations and recommendations to achieve water quality and living resource goals in areas impacted by development with particular reference to Gwynn Falls, Jones Falls, and Herring Run watersheds.

Am I correct that the gentleman's intent is to encourage EPA, the Chesapeake Executive Council, and interested governmental and nongovernmental entities to work together on studies and strategies relating to water quality and living resources in areas impacted by development?

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBERSTAR. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SHUSTER. The gentleman certainly is correct. We want to acknowledge his strong interest in this particular issue. We appreciate his cooperation. We look forward to working with him and other colleagues on cooperative, consensus-based approaches to protecting the Chesapeake Bay.

Mr. CARDIN. I want to thank the gentleman for those kind words and also thank my friend again from Minnesota for yielding.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, we certainly share the view just expressed by the chairman on the gentleman's concerns and his intent, and we will look forward to working with the gentleman on a consensus-based, cooperative approach to protecting the Chesapeake Bay.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST), one of the champions of the Chesapeake Bay.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. This has been a bipartisan effort on both sides of the aisle, from the chairman of the committee to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR). Certainly I would like to honor on this day the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BATEMAN), who has worked literally his entire career on these issues and his heart is in this greatest of estuaries, which the gentleman from Minnesota has so eloquently stated. I also want to thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) for his efforts and all of us that have worked together on this particular issue.

When John Smith came here well over 300 years ago, there were a few thousand people in the watershed. Now there are over 15 million people in the watershed. With this new census, there might be 16 or 17 million people in the watershed. So things are difficult. To manage this watershed, we need more than just one State doing their job. We need a multistate effort to ensure that human activity is in such a way that we certainly encourage economic development; but we encourage that economic development to be in harmony with the natural processes of nature so the bay can continue to be restored.

I do not think we can ever get the bay back to the way it was when John Smith was here. We will never restore the bay to its original grandeur, and we will never solve the problem. From now until the end of time, the end of human habitation, this Chesapeake Bay program is going to be vital, because we continue to have development, we continue to have agriculture, we continue to have a whole range of issues, including air deposition from as far away as the Midwest causes about a third of the nutrient overload in the Chesapeake Bay.

And so this multistate agreement is vitally important for us to learn how to reduce the nutrients, and we have found some key factors; and we are becoming successful in that. One of the other issues of the Chesapeake Bay program is to bring the bay grasses back that provides the necessary habitat for the resource, which is crabs and fish and a whole range of other things in this marine ecosystem. The bay was not intended to be a desert. Maybe the Sahara Desert has a good ecosystem, maybe the Antarctic has a good ecosystem; but the Chesapeake Bay was intended to have grass, subaquatic vegetation for the natural ecosystem to abound. The Chesapeake Bay program is figuring out, with our help, the relentless, sometimes tiring, effort to bring that resource back to the bay.

Toxic pollution. With the Clean Water Act back in 1972 when they began to think about point source pollution, we began to solve that problem.

We still have toxic pollution in the Chesapeake Bay, whether it still comes from chemical factories that we are trying to resolve and doing a good job at or point source pollutions like sewage treatment plants that need upgrades. Those are the kinds of issues that the Chesapeake Bay program deals with. It is vital.

The Chesapeake Bay program also deals with the fisheries. The oyster population is down over 90 percent from what it was at the turn of the century. Now that we are in a new turn of the century, it is time to bring those oysters back and in a manner in which nature intended, by building oyster reefs, maybe 10 feet high, maybe 20 feet high, to perpetuate that particular species. Striped bass recovery we know is pretty successful. The fisheries is a part of the Chesapeake Bay program.

I have one quick comment about a particular species called menhaden which also filters out certain nutrients in the bay like the oysters. The Chesapeake Bay program has recommended an ecosystem approach to that particular fisheries management plan where the menhaden, you give a few to the commercial watermen that use it for a variety of reasons, you give a few to the recreational fishermen, whoever wants to eat menhaden, pretty oily. But you also make sure that you give a certain number of menhaden to the rock fish that need it to sustain themselves, and you give a certain quantity of menhaden to the Chesapeake Bay so that a filtering action can occur.

1515

Mr. Chairman, the Chesapeake Bay program is vital.

I want to thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BATEMAN) for his efforts, and I want to thank all the members of this committee that have moved this program forward. I urge an "aye" vote on this bill.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT).

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), a fellow Pitt grad; the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), a Pitt grad; the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BATEMAN); the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST), a leader on conservation issues; and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), I am proud to support this, but I have had some of my companies call me and want to know if there will be any of this debris in the form of truckloads of polluted material needing abatement that will become part of an RFP, because my companies would certainly want to bid on it.

I think that this legislation would require, if there is some polluted soil or some polluted sediment underneath the Bay, in the form of a colloquy, I will ask the chairman, would it require that perhaps some of this sediment be removed? Would this bill cover that?

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRAFICANT. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, the answer to the gentleman's question will be found in each of the remedial action plans developed by the communities and the States and EPA in conjunction with each other. And those plans, depending on the nature of the problem to be addressed, may require sediment removal. Some of them, in fact, will require sediment removal, but we are not in a position to say which ones or how much.

That information, by the way, would be available from each of the States and from the localities because it all has to be part of the public record, and the companies in the gentleman's district can certainly access that information through the appropriate State agency.

I am quite certain that the remedial action plans for each community or council of governments or State will undoubtedly require some sediment removal in order to remove the toxics from the ecosystem.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRAFICANT. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, there is annual dredging that takes place in the Chesapeake Bay, millions of cubic yards behind the three hydroelectric power dams in the Susquehanna River that have right now over 200 million cubic yards of sediment that eventually within the next 15 years has to be removed, otherwise the U.S. geological survey said it would smother the entire Chesapeake Bay floor if something is not done.

There are problems with the dredge material on an annual basis. There are problems with the dredge material behind the Susquehanna River damages. So if something could be worked out in the next few years to figure out where to put this stuff and if Ohio wants it, we would be more than glad to trade it out.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I know there has been some talk about possibilities of sediment, and when they start their remediation program, it will involve cleaning up those toxic polluted areas. The point I am making is exactly that, that there are some areas that do not have the capability of cleaning those soils, and I do have in my impoverished district companies that do, in fact, take soil and clean that soil and make it acceptable under EPA law.

Mr. Chairman, we would certainly want to have our companies on notice so if there is any RFP that have an opportunity to bid. That is why I made the mention, and I want to commend the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST) because I know he is probably the biggest fighter in the House for conservation purposes.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA).

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) for his leadership in bringing this bill before us on the floor, and thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the ranking member; obviously, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BATEMAN) for initiating this; and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST), my colleague from Maryland, for his wonderful explication of some parts of it.

The Chesapeake Bay, our Nation's largest estuary, is an incredibly complex ecosystem. The Bay is one of our Nation's most valuable natural resources. Its rich ecosystem with rivers, wetlands, trees, and the Bay itself supports and provides a national habitat for over 3,600 species of plants, fish, and animals.

We know that over 15 million people now live in the Bay watershed, it includes parts of six States and the entire District of Columbia. These persons are, at all times, just a few steps from one of the more than 100,000 stream and river tributaries ultimately draining into the Bay. Every person, plant, and animal depend on each other to help the Chesapeake Bay system thrive and function properly. These complex relationships are countless. The Chesapeake Bay Program is a unique regional partnership of State and Federal Government agencies, and it has been encouraging and directing the restoration of the Bay since 1983.

I am pleased that important progress has been made in renewing the Bay since the Chesapeake Bay Agreement was signed in 1983. Restoration efforts, led by the Chesapeake Bay Program, have had a profound effect on the health of the Bay. In addition, scientific research has led to a better understanding of the Bay, including how it works and what must be done to address problems.

However, we still have a long way to go before we reach our goals for a restored Chesapeake Bay. Many questions about the future of the Bay remain unanswered. For example, blue crabs, perhaps the best known and most important resource of the Bay, have been below the long-term average level for several years. The oyster harvest has declined dramatically. Further efforts to reduce nutrient and sediment pollution are needed. I am pleased that this legislation today will help us address these concerns and allow us to move toward the goal of a restored Chesapeake Bay.

You know, Mr. Chairman, in only 10 days we recognize and celebrate the 30th anniversary of Earth Day. Every year on this day, the people of our Nation and across the globe focus their attention on the environment. Both Earth Day and the legislation before us today offer us the opportunity to applaud our progress, but, more importantly, they allow us to renew our

commitment to the challenges facing our planet and the Chesapeake Bay. We must preserve and protect this treasure.

Mr. Chairman, I support the Chesapeake Bay Restoration Act and urge its swift, unanimous passage.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin, (Mr. KIND).

(Mr. KIND asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KIND. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend from Minnesota for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 3039, the Chesapeake Bay Restoration Act. I want to commend my colleagues for the leadership they provided, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BATEMAN); the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST); the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN); and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER); as well as the leadership on the committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman Shuster); and the ranking member, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BORSKI).

Mr. Chairman, this bill seeks to reauthorize Federal participation in the Chesapeake Bay Program. It will provide the Environmental Protection Agency with \$30 million over 6 years to fund program activities that will prevent harmful nutrients and toxins from flowing into the Chesapeake, where they will degrade water quality and damage valuable fish and wildlife resources. It also mandates other Federal agencies to assist in the development of watershed planning and restoration activities.

I strongly support the Chesapeake Bay Restoration Act and the Chesapeake Bay Program, because they embody an approach to water quality and watershed management that I believe is truly the wave of the future. This approach is, first of all, proactive, rather than reactive, seeking to stop harmful nutrients and toxins from making it into the Bay in the first place, rather than relying on expensive clean-up and mitigation efforts afterwards.

Secondly, this approach is basin-wide, rather than piecemeal, seeking to look at the entire ecosystem and to develop management plans appropriate to the large scale physical system that it is.

Finally, this approach relies on inter-agency and intergovernmental cooperation, attempting to coordinate the diverse, but sometimes fragmented, conservation efforts of Federal, State and local agencies, as well as non-governmental agencies.

I want to compliment the Members from the Chesapeake Bay Basin States who have fashioned the bill and supported the Chesapeake Bay Program since its inception some 15 years ago.

I also want to take this opportunity, Mr. Chairman, to urge my colleagues

to take a close look at a bill that I recently introduce, H.R. 4013, the Upper Mississippi River Basin Conservation Act. Like H.R. 3039, my bill is comprehensive legislation to reduce nutrient and soil sediment losses in a large river basin. The Upper Mississippi River Basin, which encompasses much of Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, Illinois, and Missouri, is a tremendously valuable natural resource.

Forty percent of North America's waterfowl use the wetlands and backwaters of the river as a migratory flyway. In fact, it is North America's largest migratory route, with much of the waterfowl such as Tundra Swans ultimately going through the Mississippi corridor and ending up in the Chesapeake Bay area.

The Upper Mississippi River provides \$1.2 billion annually in recreation income and \$6.6 billion to the area's tourism industry. Unfortunately, increasing soil erosion threatens this region and these industries. For instance, soil erosion reduces the long-term sustainability and income of the family farms, with farmers losing more than \$300 million annually in applied nitrogen. Additionally, sediment fills the main shipping channel of the Upper Mississippi River, costing roughly \$100 million each year for dredging costs alone.

Relying on existing Federal, State, and local programs, H.R. 4013 establishes a water quality monitoring network and an integrated computer modeling program. These monitoring and modeling efforts will provide the baseline information needed to make scientifically sound and cost-effective conservation decisions.

The bill calls for an expansion of four U.S. Department of Agriculture land conservation programs. In addition, the bill includes language to protect personal data collected in connection with monitoring, modeling and technical and financial assessment activities.

In trying to achieve these goals, this bill relies entirely on voluntary participation and already existing conservation programs. The bill will not create any new Federal regulations.

The Chesapeake Bay Restoration Act and my bill, the Upper Mississippi River Basin Conservation Act, are basin-wide, comprehensive efforts to reduce harmful runoff and improve the overall health of these regionally and nationally significant ecosystems. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3039 today and to contact my staff and helping a sure passage of H.R. 3014.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), the ranking member of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express some concerns about H.R. 3039. I do so reluctantly, but for several reasons. My first concern is the role of the De-

partment of Agriculture in this effort. A great deal of the focus and efforts involved in getting to a cleaner and healthier Chesapeake Bay are on its upstream tributaries, and a great deal of farmland is included in these watersheds. I am particularly concerned that it appears neither the Committee on Agriculture nor the USDA were consulted in regard to this reauthorization.

We have heard how this bill simply puts into statute what is already taking place. I believe as it is part of a reauthorization, a thorough discussion should take place regarding the best ways to accomplish the goals of the program and whether the current structure is accomplishing that.

That leads to my questions about why current authorized programs are not being utilized or modified, if necessary, to accomplish the outlined goals, as opposed to putting forward a new program or authority. This has led to a number of programs out there, and in the case of conservation and environmental protection, a number of authorities that are not interconnected and do not have adequate resources to meet the demands for assistance.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STENHOLM. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, I understand the gentleman's concern with Agriculture not being consulted, the perception that they were not consulted about this piece of legislation. But I can tell the gentleman that with regard to the Chesapeake Bay Program, the biggest industry in my business is agriculture, and USDA and the Departments of Agriculture in Maryland, Delaware, Virginia and Pennsylvania have all worked through a variety of existing programs to ensure the quality of water in the Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries via many agricultural programs that exist, for example, the Buffer Program, the Waterway Program, the program that provides habitat for wildlife, the CRP Program.

1530

So there is a whole range of programs that the Chesapeake Bay program, which is EPA, consults with these other agencies to ensure water quality, and also the biggest thing I would like to say, I say to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), is to ensure that agriculture remains not only a viable industry but a profitable industry.

Mr. STENHOLM. I thank the gentleman for those comments.

Just as I was about to say, I have no doubt that the USDA agencies and their partners, the conservation districts and resource conservation and development councils, are already taking an active role in many of the actions springing out of the Chesapeake Bay Agreement.

I concur. In fact, one of the major roles of USDA in the conservation dis-

trict is to provide technical assistance to whoever might need it. Whether it is technical assistance or other types of assistance, the USDA agencies and their partners have and will find ways to provide that assistance to whoever might be asking, whether they be a private individual, a nonprofit group, or a local government.

I am also concerned about this legislation and similar bills that are targeted to specific geographic locations. I am certain they are all worthy pieces of legislation, and I support the gentleman and the others in the Chesapeake Bay's effort because they are right on target. My concern is the duplication.

I appreciate the watershed approach. That is the way to go. I am joining today with the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER) in introducing the Fishable Waters Act, which would provide much needed guidance and funding to any and all States to address water quality problems that have led to fisheries habitat problems.

My concern, though, is funding. When we continue to divide, issue after issue, when we continue to say USDA, that is doing a wonderful job, but not doing good enough, so therefore, we are going to take EPA and we are going to grant them money to provide technical assistance when we are already short-changing, here.

We talk about the environmental quality incentive program. It is funded at \$200 million a year, but we only spend \$174 million. Appropriations cut us short. We look at the Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program. The small watershed program is the one, though. We have 1,630 projects right now approved, needing \$1.5 billion in funding. We are funded at \$91. I believe this bill further divides already scarce resources, and that is my concern.

Mr. Chairman, CRP—Authorized at 36.4 million acres—currently 31 million acres enrolled—up to 3.5 million acres in bids received in 20th sign-up; WRP—Authorized at 975,000 acres—estimated to have 935,000 acres enrolled by end of 2000; Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program—Funded at \$50 million in 1996 Farm Bill and funding already exhausted; PL—566 (Small Watershed Program)—1630 projects approved needing \$1.5 billion in funding—funded at \$91 million in FY00; and EQIP (Environmental Quality Incentives Program)—Funded at \$200 million per year in 1996 Farm bill—appropriators have limited funding to \$174 million in each of last three fiscal years—demand is three times greater than available funding.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), a diligent member of the Committee.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, since being elected to Congress, I have been focusing attention on the issue of creating livable communities where families are safe, healthy, and economically secure. The

quality and quantity of our water supply is going to be the primary shaper of our communities in the next century.

This is one of the reasons why I am here today, pleased to join in rising in support for the fine work that the committee has done, and thanking the ranking member, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST), and others in focusing attention and making sure that we are able to continue the great work that has been done in the Chesapeake Bay area.

It has been documented already on the floor of the Chamber today the vast sweep of the Chesapeake Bay watershed, the 64,000 square miles covering parts of six States talking about the problems that are faced here that are serious but not unique to the Chesapeake Bay system, and how the Chesapeake Bay is a great example of watershed-wide management; how we are excited about the multijurisdictional involvement of many shareholders dealing with the EPA, dealing with State and local authorities, and other disciplines, and the legislative bodies of three States, bringing into involvement a vast coalition of people outside the government sweep, of agencies, nonprofits, and private citizens; the tributary teams in Maryland, divided into ten major tributaries and teams made up of citizens, farmers, business interests, environmentalists, and others, who determine the primary issues in their watersheds, and how to go about educating and involving citizens based on the idea that the problems are different depending on where you are.

The good news is that through all of this effort, the Bay is improving, albeit slowly. The Chesapeake Bay Foundation has put together a report card on the Bay. The score was up to 28 last year, up from the historic low of roughly 23 in 1983, on their way towards a goal or a rating of 70.

I appreciate the elements that are included in H.R. 3039 to support the EPA Bay program and its activity in the watershed, the pollution prevention, restoring activities, monitoring, grants to States, and other stakeholders and citizen involvement.

I am here, though, not just to commend my colleagues on the committee and the others who are involved. I do hope that we are able as a committee and as a Congress to incorporate the lessons that we have learned with the Chesapeake Bay clean-up, and perhaps even in this Congress have a comprehensive piece of legislation that we could advance to our colleagues to make sure that the important approach that has been taken with the Chesapeake Bay clean-up is not an exception, but in fact it is the rule governing how we will approach these important areas across the country.

Under the leadership of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), the gentleman from Minnesota

(Mr. OBERSTAR), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BORSKI), the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), with concerned members of the committee, with others in Congress, we can make sure that these lessons that have been learned, the dollars we are able to stretch, the engagement that we can have with our citizens, become an important part of Federal policy.

If we are able to do that, Mr. Speaker, we will have given an important gift to American citizens for Earth Day, not just one or two models of an exemplary clean-up that hold a lot of potential for the future, but a template that will guide the authorizing committee, a template that will guide the appropriating committee, a template that will guide across jurisdictions in the Federal government to show how we can achieve a more livable community, looking at the way we can manage our water resources.

Mr. Chairman, I look forward to greater progress in the future.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. GUTKNECHT). All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The text of H.R. 3039 is as follows:

H.R. 3039

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Chesapeake Bay Restoration Act of 1999".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the Chesapeake Bay is a national treasure and a resource of worldwide significance;

(2) over many years, the productivity and water quality of the Chesapeake Bay and its watershed were diminished by pollution, excessive sedimentation, shoreline erosion, the impacts of population growth and development in the Chesapeake Bay watershed, and other factors;

(3) the Federal Government (acting through the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency), the Governor of the State of Maryland, the Governor of the Commonwealth of Virginia, the Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the Chairperson of the Chesapeake Bay Commission, and the Mayor of the District of Columbia, as Chesapeake Bay Agreement signatories, have committed to a comprehensive cooperative program to achieve improved water quality and improvements in the productivity of living resources of the Bay;

(4) the cooperative program described in paragraph (3) serves as a national and international model for the management of estuaries; and

(5) there is a need to expand Federal support for monitoring, management, and restoration activities in the Chesapeake Bay and the tributaries of the Bay in order to meet and further the original and subsequent goals and commitments of the Chesapeake Bay Program.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to expand and strengthen cooperative efforts to restore and protect the Chesapeake Bay; and

(2) to achieve the goals established in the Chesapeake Bay Agreement.

SEC. 3. CHESAPEAKE BAY.

The Federal Water Pollution Control Act is amended by striking section 117 (33 U.S.C. 1267) and inserting the following:

"SEC. 117. CHESAPEAKE BAY.

"(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the following definitions apply:

"(1) ADMINISTRATIVE COST.—The term 'administrative cost' means the cost of salaries and fringe benefits incurred in administering a grant under this section.

"(2) CHESAPEAKE BAY AGREEMENT.—The term 'Chesapeake Bay Agreement' means the formal, voluntary agreements executed to achieve the goal of restoring and protecting the Chesapeake Bay ecosystem and the living resources of the Chesapeake Bay ecosystem and signed by the Chesapeake Executive Council.

"(3) CHESAPEAKE BAY ECOSYSTEM.—The term 'Chesapeake Bay ecosystem' means the ecosystem of the Chesapeake Bay and its watershed.

"(4) CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM.—The term 'Chesapeake Bay Program' means the program directed by the Chesapeake Executive Council in accordance with the Chesapeake Bay Agreement.

"(5) CHESAPEAKE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL.—The term 'Chesapeake Executive Council' means the signatories to the Chesapeake Bay Agreement.

"(6) SIGNATORY JURISDICTION.—The term 'signatory jurisdiction' means a jurisdiction of a signatory to the Chesapeake Bay Agreement.

"(b) CONTINUATION OF CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—In cooperation with the Chesapeake Executive Council (and as a member of the Council), the Administrator shall continue the Chesapeake Bay Program.

"(2) PROGRAM OFFICE.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall maintain in the Environmental Protection Agency a Chesapeake Bay Program Office.

"(B) FUNCTION.—The Chesapeake Bay Program Office shall provide support to the Chesapeake Executive Council by—

"(i) implementing and coordinating science, research, modeling, support services, monitoring, data collection, and other activities that support the Chesapeake Bay Program;

"(ii) developing and making available, through publications, technical assistance, and other appropriate means, information pertaining to the environmental quality and living resources of the Chesapeake Bay ecosystem;

"(iii) in cooperation with appropriate Federal, State, and local authorities, assisting the signatories to the Chesapeake Bay Agreement in developing and implementing specific action plans to carry out the responsibilities of the signatories to the Chesapeake Bay Agreement;

"(iv) coordinating the actions of the Environmental Protection Agency with the actions of the appropriate officials of other Federal agencies and State and local authorities in developing strategies to—

"(I) improve the water quality and living resources in the Chesapeake Bay ecosystem; and

"(II) obtain the support of the appropriate officials of the agencies and authorities in achieving the objectives of the Chesapeake Bay Agreement; and

"(v) implementing outreach programs for public information, education, and participation to foster stewardship of the resources of the Chesapeake Bay.

“(c) INTERAGENCY AGREEMENTS.—The Administrator may enter into an interagency agreement with a Federal agency to carry out this section.

“(d) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND ASSISTANCE GRANTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In cooperation with the Chesapeake Executive Council, the Administrator may provide technical assistance, and assistance grants, to nonprofit organizations, State and local governments, colleges, universities, and interstate agencies to achieve the goals and requirements contained in subsection (g)(1), subject to such terms and conditions as the Administrator considers appropriate.

“(2) FEDERAL SHARE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the Federal share of an assistance grant provided under paragraph (1) shall be determined by the Administrator in accordance with guidance issued by the Administrator.

“(B) SMALL WATERSHED GRANTS PROGRAM.—The Federal share of an assistance grant provided under paragraph (1) to carry out an implementing activity under subsection (g)(2) shall not exceed 75 percent of eligible project costs, as determined by the Administrator.

“(3) NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—An assistance grant under paragraph (1) shall be provided on the condition that non-Federal sources provide the remainder of eligible project costs, as determined by the Administrator.

“(4) ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—Administrative costs shall not exceed 10 percent of the annual grant award.

“(e) IMPLEMENTATION AND MONITORING GRANTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—If a signatory jurisdiction has approved and committed to implement all or substantially all aspects of the Chesapeake Bay Agreement, on the request of the chief executive of the jurisdiction, the Administrator—

“(A) shall make a grant to the jurisdiction for the purpose of implementing the management mechanisms established under the Chesapeake Bay Agreement, subject to such terms and conditions as the Administrator considers appropriate; and

“(B) may make a grant to a signatory jurisdiction for the purpose of monitoring the Chesapeake Bay ecosystem.

“(2) PROPOSALS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A signatory jurisdiction described in paragraph (1) may apply for a grant under this subsection for a fiscal year by submitting to the Administrator a comprehensive proposal to implement management mechanisms established under the Chesapeake Bay Agreement.

“(B) CONTENTS.—A proposal under subparagraph (A) shall include—

“(i) a description of proposed management mechanisms that the jurisdiction commits to take within a specified time period, such as reducing or preventing pollution in the Chesapeake Bay and its watershed or meeting applicable water quality standards or established goals and objectives under the Chesapeake Bay Agreement; and

“(ii) the estimated cost of the actions proposed to be taken during the fiscal year.

“(3) APPROVAL.—If the Administrator finds that the proposal is consistent with the Chesapeake Bay Agreement and the national goals established under section 101(a), the Administrator may approve the proposal for an award.

“(4) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of an implementation grant under this subsection shall not exceed 50 percent of the cost of implementing the management mechanisms during the fiscal year.

“(5) NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—An implementation grant under this subsection shall be made on the condition that non-Federal

sources provide the remainder of the costs of implementing the management mechanisms during the fiscal year.

“(6) ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—Administrative costs shall not exceed 10 percent of the annual grant award.

“(7) REPORTING.—On or before October 1 of each fiscal year, the Administrator shall make available to the public a document that lists and describes, in the greatest practicable degree of detail—

“(A) all projects and activities funded for the fiscal year;

“(B) the goals and objectives of projects funded for the previous fiscal year; and

“(C) the net benefits of projects funded for previous fiscal years.

“(f) FEDERAL FACILITIES AND BUDGET COORDINATION.—

“(1) SUBWATERSHED PLANNING AND RESTORATION.—A Federal agency that owns or operates a facility (as defined by the Administrator) within the Chesapeake Bay watershed shall participate in regional and subwatershed planning and restoration programs.

“(2) COMPLIANCE WITH AGREEMENT.—The head of each Federal agency that owns or occupies real property in the Chesapeake Bay watershed shall ensure that the property, and actions taken by the agency with respect to the property, comply with the Chesapeake Bay Agreement, the Federal Agencies Chesapeake Ecosystem Unified Plan, and any subsequent agreements and plans.

“(3) BUDGET COORDINATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—As part of the annual budget submission of each Federal agency with projects or grants related to restoration, planning, monitoring, or scientific investigation of the Chesapeake Bay ecosystem, the head of the agency shall submit to the President a report that describes plans for the expenditure of the funds under this section.

“(B) DISCLOSURE TO THE COUNCIL.—The head of each agency referred to in subparagraph (A) shall disclose the report under that subparagraph with the Chesapeake Executive Council as appropriate.

“(g) CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM.—

“(1) MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES.—The Administrator, in coordination with other members of the Chesapeake Executive Council, shall ensure that management plans are developed and implementation is begun by signatories to the Chesapeake Bay Agreement to achieve—

“(A) the nutrient goals of the Chesapeake Bay Agreement for the quantity of nitrogen and phosphorus entering the Chesapeake Bay and its watershed;

“(B) the water quality requirements necessary to restore living resources in the Chesapeake Bay ecosystem;

“(C) the Chesapeake Bay Basinwide Toxins Reduction and Prevention Strategy goal of reducing or eliminating the input of chemical contaminants from all controllable sources to levels that result in no toxic or bioaccumulative impact on the living resources of the Chesapeake Bay ecosystem or on human health;

“(D) habitat restoration, protection, creation, and enhancement goals established by Chesapeake Bay Agreement signatories for wetlands, riparian forests, and other types of habitat associated with the Chesapeake Bay ecosystem; and

“(E) the restoration, protection, creation, and enhancement goals established by the Chesapeake Bay Agreement signatories for living resources associated with the Chesapeake Bay ecosystem.

“(2) SMALL WATERSHED GRANTS PROGRAM.—The Administrator, in cooperation with the Chesapeake Executive Council, shall—

“(A) establish a small watershed grants program as part of the Chesapeake Bay Program; and

“(B) offer technical assistance and assistance grants under subsection (d) to local governments and nonprofit organizations and individuals in the Chesapeake Bay region to implement—

“(i) cooperative tributary basin strategies that address the water quality and living resource needs in the Chesapeake Bay ecosystem; and

“(ii) locally based protection and restoration programs or projects within a watershed that complement the tributary basin strategies, including the creation, restoration, protection, or enhancement of habitat associated with the Chesapeake Bay ecosystem.

“(h) STUDY OF CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than April 22, 2000, and every 5 years thereafter, the Administrator, in coordination with the Chesapeake Executive Council, shall complete a study and submit to Congress a comprehensive report on the results of the study.

“(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The study and report shall—

“(A) assess the state of the Chesapeake Bay ecosystem;

“(B) compare the current state of the Chesapeake Bay ecosystem with its state in 1975, 1985, and 1995;

“(C) assess the effectiveness of management strategies being implemented on the date of enactment of this section and the extent to which the priority needs are being met;

“(D) make recommendations for the improved management of the Chesapeake Bay Program either by strengthening strategies being implemented on the date of enactment of this section or by adopting new strategies; and

“(E) be presented in such a format as to be readily transferable to and usable by other watershed restoration programs.

“(i) SPECIAL STUDY OF LIVING RESOURCE RESPONSE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Administrator shall commence a 5-year special study with full participation of the scientific community of the Chesapeake Bay to establish and expand understanding of the response of the living resources of the Chesapeake Bay ecosystem to improvements in water quality that have resulted from investments made through the Chesapeake Bay Program.

“(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The study shall—

“(A) determine the current status and trends of living resources, including grasses, benthos, phytoplankton, zooplankton, fish, and shellfish;

“(B) establish to the extent practicable the rates of recovery of the living resources in response to improved water quality condition;

“(C) evaluate and assess interactions of species, with particular attention to the impact of changes within and among trophic levels; and

“(D) recommend management actions to optimize the return of a healthy and balanced ecosystem in response to improvements in the quality and character of the waters of the Chesapeake Bay.

“(j) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$30,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2000 through 2005.”

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chair may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment that he has printed in the

designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered as read.

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone a request for a recorded vote on any amendment, and may reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the time for voting on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote, provided that the time for the voting on the first question shall be a minimum of 15 minutes.

Are there any amendments to the bill?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TRAFICANT:

At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. . SENSE OF CONGRESS; REQUIREMENT REGARDING NOTICE

(a) PURCHASE OF AMERICAN-MADE EQUIPMENT AND PRODUCTS.—In the case of any equipment or products that may be authorized to be purchased with financial assistance provided under section 117 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. It is the sense of the Congress that entities receiving such assistance should, in expending the assistance, purchase only American-made equipment and products.

(b) NOTICE TO RECIPIENTS OF ASSISTANCE.—In providing financial assistance under such section, the head of each Federal agency shall provide to each recipient of the assistance a notice describing the statement made in subsection (a) by the Congress.

(c) NOTICE OF REPORT.—Any entity which receives funds under such section shall report any expenditures on foreign-made items to the Congress within 180 days of the expenditure.

Mr. TRAFICANT (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is the same as the amendment offered on the last bill.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRAFICANT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I understand this is the new and improved version of the amendment which we have previously accepted. We are pleased to accept this, as well.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRAFICANT. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, we have reviewed the gentleman's amendment. It is in conformity with the rules of the House, and it is a sense of Congress buy American amendment. We are happy to support Mr. Buy America.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I urge an aye vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there further amendments to the bill.

If there are no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CRANE) having assumed the chair, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3039) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to assist in the restoration of the Chesapeake Bay, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 470, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2328 and H.R. 3039.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will now put each question on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order: Passage of H.R. 2328, by the yeas and nays; passage of H.R. 3039, by the yeas and nays; and a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2884.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first such vote in this series.

THE CLEAN LAKES PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of the passage of the bill, H.R. 2328, on which further proceedings were postponed.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 420, nays 5, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 120]

YEAS—420

Ackerman	Davis (IL)	Horn
Aderholt	Davis (VA)	Hoyer
Allen	Deal	Hulshof
Andrews	DeFazio	Hunter
Archer	Delahunt	Hutchinson
Armey	DeLauro	Hyde
Baca	DeLay	Inslee
Bachus	DeMint	Isakson
Baird	Deusch	Istook
Baker	Diaz-Balart	Jackson (IL)
Baldacci	Dickey	Jackson-Lee
Baldwin	Dicks	(TX)
Ballenger	Dingell	Jefferson
Barcia	Dixon	Jenkins
Barr	Doggett	John
Barrett (NE)	Dooley	Johnson (CT)
Barrett (WI)	Doolittle	Johnson, E. B.
Bartlett	Doyle	Johnson, Sam
Barton	Dreier	Jones (NC)
Bass	Duncan	Jones (OH)
Bateman	Dunn	Kanjorski
Becerra	Edwards	Kaptur
Bentsen	Ehlers	Kasich
Bereuter	Ehrlich	Kelly
Berkley	Emerson	Kennedy
Berman	Engel	Kildee
Berry	English	Kilpatrick
Biggert	Eshoo	Kind (WI)
Bilbray	Etheridge	King (NY)
Bilirakis	Evans	Kingston
Bishop	Everett	Klecza
Blagojevich	Ewing	Klink
Bliley	Farr	Knollenberg
Blumenauer	Fattah	Kolbe
Blunt	Filner	Kucinich
Boehlert	Fletcher	Kuykendall
Boehner	Foley	LaFalce
Bonilla	Forbes	LaHood
Bonior	Ford	Lampson
Bono	Fossella	Lantos
Borski	Fowler	Largent
Boswell	Frank (MA)	Larson
Boucher	Franks (NJ)	Latham
Boyd	Frelinghuysen	LaTourette
Brady (PA)	Frost	Lazio
Brady (TX)	Gallegly	Leach
Brown (FL)	Ganske	Lee
Brown (OH)	Gejdenson	Levin
Bryant	Gekas	Lewis (CA)
Burr	Gibbons	Lewis (GA)
Burton	Gilchrest	Lewis (KY)
Buyer	Gillmor	Linder
Callahan	Gilman	Lipinski
Calvert	Gonzalez	LoBiondo
Camp	Goode	Lofgren
Campbell	Goodlatte	Lowe
Canady	Goodling	Lucas (KY)
Cannon	Gordon	Lucas (OK)
Capps	Goss	Luther
Capuano	Graham	Maloney (CT)
Cardin	Granger	Maloney (NY)
Carson	Green (TX)	Manzullo
Castle	Green (WI)	Markey
Chabot	Greenwood	Martinez
Chambliss	Gutierrez	Mascara
Chenoweth-Hage	Gutknecht	Matsui
Clay	Hall (OH)	McCarthy (MO)
Clayton	Hall (TX)	McCarthy (NY)
Clement	Hansen	McCollum
Clyburn	Hastings (FL)	McCrery
Coble	Hastings (WA)	McDermott
Coburn	Hayes	McGovern
Collins	Hayworth	McHugh
Combest	Hefley	McInnis
Condit	Herger	McIntyre
Conyers	Hill (IN)	McKeon
Cooksey	Hill (MT)	McKinney
Costello	Hilleary	McNulty
Cox	Hilliard	Meehan
Coyne	Hinchey	Meek (FL)
Cramer	Hinojosa	Meeks (NY)
Crane	Hobson	Menendez
Crowley	Hoefel	Metcalf
Cubin	Hoekstra	Mica
Cunningham	Holden	Millender-
Danner	Holt	McDonald
Davis (FL)	Hooley	Miller (FL)

Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley

Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak

Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—5

Hostettler
Paul

Royce
Sanford

Sensenbrenner

NOT VOTING—9

Abercrombie
Cook
Cummings

DeGette
Gephardt
Houghton

McIntosh
Mollohan
Obey

1607

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts changed his vote from "nay" to "yea". So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GUTKNECHT). Pursuant to the provisions of clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on the remaining two questions on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

CHESAPEAKE BAY RESTORATION ACT OF 1999

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of the passage of the bill, H.R. 3039, on which

further proceedings were postponed earlier today.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 418, nays 7, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 121]

YEAS—418

Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggart
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bile
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crowley
Cubin

Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinche
Hinojosa

Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Klecza
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney

McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalfe
Mica
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn

Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns

Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—7

Chenoweth-Hage
Duncan
Hostettler

Paul
Sanford
Schaffer

Sensenbrenner

NOT VOTING—9

Abercrombie
Cook
Cummings

DeGette
Gephardt
Houghton

McIntosh
Mollohan
Smith (MI)

1617

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ENERGY POLICY AND CONSERVATION ACT REAUTHORIZATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GUTKNECHT). The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 2884, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2884, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 416, nays 8, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 122]

YEAS—416

Ackerman	DeLauro	Jefferson
Aderholt	DeLay	Jenkins
Allen	DeMint	John
Andrews	Deutsch	Johnson (CT)
Archer	Diaz-Balart	Johnson, E. B.
Army	Dickey	Johnson, Sam
Baca	Dicks	Jones (NC)
Bachus	Dingell	Jones (OH)
Baird	Dixon	Kanjorski
Baker	Doggett	Kaptur
Baldacci	Dooley	Kasich
Baldwin	Doolittle	Kelly
Ballenger	Doyle	Kennedy
Barcia	Dreier	Kildee
Barr	Dunn	Kilpatrick
Barrett (NE)	Edwards	Kind (WI)
Barrett (WI)	Ehlers	King (NY)
Bartlett	Ehrlich	Kingston
Barton	Emerson	Klecza
Bass	Engel	Klink
Bateman	English	Knollenberg
Becerra	Eshoo	Kolbe
Bentsen	Etheridge	Kucinich
Bereuter	Evans	Kuykendall
Berkley	Everett	LaFalce
Berman	Ewing	LaHood
Berry	Farr	Lampson
Biggert	Fattah	Lantos
Bilbray	Filner	Largent
Billirakis	Fletcher	Larson
Bishop	Foley	Latham
Blagojevich	Forbes	LaTourette
Bliley	Ford	Lazio
Blumenauer	Fossella	Leach
Blunt	Fowler	Lee
Boehlert	Frank (MA)	Levin
Boehner	Franks (NJ)	Lewis (CA)
Bonilla	Frelinghuysen	Lewis (GA)
Bonior	Frost	Lewis (KY)
Bono	Galleghy	Linder
Borski	Ganske	Lipinski
Boswell	Gejdenson	LoBiondo
Boucher	Gekas	Lofgren
Boyd	Gibbons	Lowey
Brady (PA)	Gilchrest	Lucas (KY)
Brady (TX)	Gillmor	Lucas (OK)
Brown (FL)	Gilman	Luther
Brown (OH)	Gonzalez	Maloney (CT)
Bryant	Goode	Maloney (NY)
Burr	Goodlatte	Manzullo
Burton	Goodling	Markey
Buyer	Gordon	Martinez
Callahan	Goss	Mascara
Calvert	Graham	Matsui
Camp	Granger	McCarthy (MO)
Campbell	Green (TX)	McCarthy (NY)
Canady	Green (WI)	McCollum
Cannon	Greenwood	McCrery
Capps	Gutierrez	McDermott
Capuano	Gutknecht	McGovern
Cardin	Hall (OH)	McHugh
Carson	Hall (TX)	McInnis
Castle	Hansen	McIntyre
Chabot	Hastings (FL)	McKeon
Chambliss	Hastings (WA)	McKinney
Chenoweth-Hage		McNulty
Clay	Hayworth	Meehan
Clayton	Hefley	Meek (FL)
Clement	Herger	Meeks (NY)
Clyburn	Hill (IN)	Menendez
Coble	Hill (MT)	Metcalfe
Coburn	Hilleary	Mica
Collins	Hilliard	Millender-
Combust	Hinchey	McDonald
Condit	Hinojosa	Miller (FL)
Conyers	Hobson	Miller, Gary
Cooksey	Hoeffel	Miller, George
Costello	Hoekstra	Minge
Cox	Holden	Mink
Coyne	Holt	Moore
Cramer	Hooley	Moran (KS)
Crane	Horn	Moran (VA)
Crowley	Hoyer	Morella
Cubin	Hulshof	Murtha
Cunningham	Hunter	Myrick
Danner	Hutchinson	Nadler
Davis (FL)	Inslee	Napolitano
Davis (IL)	Isakson	Neal
Davis (VA)	Istook	Nethercutt
Deal	Jackson (IL)	Ney
DeFazio	Jackson-Lee	Northup
Delahunt	(TX)	Norwood

Nussle	Ryun (KS)	Tauzin
Oberstar	Sabo	Taylor (MS)
Obey	Salmon	Taylor (NC)
Olver	Sanchez	Terry
Ortiz	Sanders	Thomas
Ose	Sandlin	Thompson (CA)
Owens	Sawyer	Thompson (MS)
Oxley	Saxton	Thornberry
Packard	Scarborough	Thune
Pallone	Schaffer	Thurman
Pascarella	Schakowsky	Tiahrt
Pastor	Scott	Tierney
Payne	Serrano	Towns
Pease	Sessions	Traficant
Pelosi	Shadegg	Turner
Peterson (MN)	Shaw	Udall (CO)
Peterson (PA)	Shays	Udall (NM)
Petri	Sherman	Upton
Phelps	Sherwood	Velazquez
Pickering	Shimkus	Vento
Pickett	Shows	Visclosky
Pombo	Shuster	Vitter
Pomeroy	Simpson	Walden
Porter	Sisisky	Walsh
Portman	Skeen	Wamp
Price (NC)	Skelton	Waters
Pryce (OH)	Slaughter	Watkins
Quinn	Smith (MI)	Watt (NC)
Radanovich	Smith (NJ)	Watts (OK)
Rahall	Smith (TX)	Waxman
Ramstad	Smith (WA)	Weiner
Rangel	Snyder	Weldon (FL)
Regula	Souder	Weldon (PA)
Reyes	Spence	Weller
Reynolds	Spratt	Wexler
Riley	Stabenow	Weygand
Rivers	Stark	Whitfield
Rodriguez	Stearns	Wicker
Roemer	Stenholm	Wilson
Rogan	Strickland	Wise
Rogers	Stump	Wolf
Rohrabacher	Stupak	Woolsey
Ros-Lehtinen	Sununu	Wu
Rothman	Sweeney	Wynn
Roukema	Talent	Young (AK)
Roybal-Allard	Tancred	Young (FL)
Rush	Tanner	
Ryan (WI)	Tauscher	

NAYS—8

Duncan	Pitts	Sensenbrenner
Hostettler	Royce	Toomey
Paul	Sanford	

NOT VOTING—10

Abercrombie	Gephardt	Moakley
Cook	Houghton	Mollohan
Cummings	Hyde	
DeGette	McIntosh	

1626

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon, I was unavoidably detained by a Hawaii Congressional delegation meeting with the Secretary of Interior, and I consequently was unable to vote on three recorded votes. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: Rollcall 120, to pass H.R. 2328, to reauthorize the Clean Lakes Program—"yes"; rollcall 121, to pass H.R. 3039, Chesapeake Bay water restoration—"yes"; rollcall 122, to pass H.R. 2884, to extend the Strategic Petroleum Reserve program—"yes."

PROVIDING FOR ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE ON THURSDAY, APRIL 13, 2000 OR FRIDAY, APRIL 14, 2000 UNTIL TUESDAY, MAY 2, 2000; AND PROVIDING FOR RECESS OR ADJOURNMENT OF THE SENATE ON THURSDAY, APRIL 13, 2000 OR FRIDAY, APRIL 14, 2000 UNTIL TUESDAY, APRIL 25, 2000

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res 330) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 303

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the House adjourns on the legislative day of Thursday, April 13, 2000, or Friday, April 14, 2000, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand adjourned until 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, May 2, 2000, for morning-hour debate, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the Senate recesses or adjourns at the close of business on Thursday, April 13, 2000, or Friday, April 14, 2000, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand recessed or adjourned until noon on Tuesday, April 25, 2000, or such time on that day as may be specified by its Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The Speaker of the House and the Majority Leader of the Senate, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the House and the Majority Leader of the Senate, shall notify the Members of the House and the Senate, respectively, to reassemble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3439, RADIO BROADCASTING PRESERVATION ACT OF 2000

Mr. LINDER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-575) on the resolution (H. Res. 472) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3439) to prohibit the Federal Communications Commission from establishing rules authorizing the operation of new, low power FM radio stations, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4199, DATE CERTAIN TAX CODE REPLACEMENT ACT

Mr. LINDER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-576) on the resolution (H. Res. 473) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4199) to terminate the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, which was

referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

1630

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1824

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1824.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GUTKNECHT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

ST. PETER'S MASS HOSTED BY REPUBLICAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KLECZKA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, today's mass at St. Peter's will be hosted by the Republican Conference. The homily will be given by the House Chaplain and he will speak in support of the H.R. 4199, to abolish the Tax Code by the year 2004. Does that sound ridiculous to my colleagues? It sure does to me as a Catholic Member of this House.

But let me review for my colleagues what transpired yesterday. There was a mass at St. Peter's hosted by the Republican National Committee to honor and to introduce the new chaplain of the House followed by a reception in the church basement.

We were told that all Members were invited to mass. But in reality, only 26 Republicans were given the invitation.

Mr. Speaker, masses have been conducted in this world by Catholic clergy for centuries; and never, never in my recollection have they been hosted by a political party.

I think it is wrong. I think it is misdirected. And I am told at the mass itself speaking to the congregation was the chairman of the Republican National Committee, Mr. Nicholson, and a former Member of this House who headed up the campaign committee.

I think the Republicans have gone too far this time. For those of my colleagues who do not know the background, the chaplain of the House announced he was retiring. The Speaker appointed a bipartisan Search Committee made up of nine Republicans and nine Democrats to find a new chaplain. They interviewed 37 clergymen, and they came up with the top choice of a Catholic priest.

But that was not to be. The Republicans would not stand still for a Catholic, the first in the history of this country to be chaplain of this House.

So they bypassed him for the man who came in number three. Then a big uproar occurred.

Catholics throughout the country were just totally up in arms, and they knew they were going to lose the Catholic vote this November. So what do they do? They bring a resolution to the floor praising the Catholic schools.

I am a product of that Catholic education. I do not need my Republican colleagues telling me how good the education is. They kept slipping with the Catholics. Then they found Cardinal O'Connor in New York. So one day we had a resolution to give him a gold medal and that still did not help the slippage with the Catholic vote.

So then the Speaker swallowed his pride and he himself appointed a Catholic priest from Chicago who was not interviewed by the committee but he was a Catholic, and he thought that would stop the hemorrhage of the loss of the Catholic vote; and everything was quiet for a couple weeks and we started to heal. And then, out of the blue, comes a mass at St. Peter's sponsored by the Republican National Committee.

Mr. Speaker, today the only word that my colleagues could come up with was this is "disgusting." The Catholic celebration of mass does not need promotion from my colleagues, guys. We go there voluntarily. If it was the Democratic party pulling this nonsense, I would be on this floor tonight.

When is this going to stop? Are they going to ridicule my entire religion? Have they bought into the notion from Bob Jones University that we are a cult, that the Pope is anti-Christ?

In the press reports today on this debacle, we are told by a spokesman for the Republican National Committee that he is sorry that some Democrats were finding fault with this event, with this "event."

The mastermind who they dusted off, a former ambassador to the Vatican, stated in this article, I have been to events sponsored by lots of organizations, including Democrats, and there has never been any problem.

Is this an event? Is this like a college football bowl game where there is a sponsor, the Rose Bowl is brought to us by Microsoft, today's mass is brought to us by some foundation?

Mr. Speaker, the Republicans in the House have gone over the line. I have asked the Catholic Bishop's Conference to review this matter. I believe that what they have done is turn this Catholic chaplain into a Republican poster-priest.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentle-

woman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ANSWERS FROM NATIONAL READING PANEL ON AMERICAN CHILDREN'S READING LEVELS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky (Ms. NORTHUP) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. NORTHUP. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is an important day for all of our schoolchildren and all of our children across this country.

When I came to Congress 3½ years ago, the rate of children that could not even read at basic level in our schools across this country was 40 percent. Forty percent of all schoolchildren in the fourth grade could not even read at basic levels.

Clearly, as we have poured resources, we have poured time and attention and research into making sure our children all learn to read, we were missing the mark with some our children.

I am sure all of us do not need to be reminded how important it is that children learn to read. They learn to read first in kindergarten and first grade so that they can go on about in fourth grade to other things: science, health, geography, social studies, all other subjects that require good reading skills.

We also know from research that if a child does not learn to read by the beginning of fourth grade, there is a very strong probability that that child will never learn to read at their capacity. Because, in those early years, children are at the stage of brain development where they can learn to read, learn to read quickly, and accurately, learn fluency, and learn to put what they see on the written page into understanding ideas and convert it and learn that information.

That is a time in their lives where they are particularly adept at that; and if they miss that opportunity, they are going to find it very difficult at any age and with any amount of work to learn to read at their capacity.

So it is a serious problem in this country that we confront today as so many of our children miss this time in their lives when they learn to read.

We know that everybody means for children to read, and we believe that all children can learn at a high level. And so, it was important that we ask the question, what are we doing that is not right? What are we missing? The questions that need to be answered are, how do children learn to read? At what age do children go through the stages of learning to read? We need to know at what time we need to intervene when children are not going through those stages and are not learning to read as we hope they will. And what kind of intervention works best?

Three years ago, Congress put into the appropriations bill for the education appropriation and health education a research requirement that the Department of Education and the National Institute of Child Health and Development together look at all research that has been done on how children learn to read to give us a better road map, answer the questions that have so confounded us for so many of our children.

Today, I am thrilled to know that tomorrow the National Reading Panel is going to give us their answers. They are going to tell us what all the research together tells us about how children learn to read. They are going to answer many of the questions that we have, many of the questions that our teachers around this country want so that they can have a better road map as they approach reading in ways that are the most effective.

I am here today to share with the American people and with the Congress the importance that, number one, we have this information; number two, that we make sure that our teachers in our schools around the country get this information and that it is incorporated into our lessons as we go forward in our efforts to make sure that every child learn and learn at a high level; number 3, that we make sure that all future research is done according to standards that will give us the feedback we need to answer additional questions that we have.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that our children are waiting for us to have this answer. They only get to be 6 years old once in their life. They only get to be in that time of their life once where they can learn to read and they can learn to read well. After that, it is a struggle.

And so, for every child that today is in the first grade, for every child that tomorrow and next year will be in the first grade, let us make sure that we listen to what the scientists can tell us. They can give us a good road map on what we are doing right and what we are doing wrong. And may we please not be so closed minded or set in our ways that we cannot change and adjust and incorporate in our schools and in our children's lives this information that we have waited so long for.

ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) for organizing this special order this evening on the Armenian genocide.

The leadership on this issue of importance to Armenian people has been vital. It is with some sadness that I know this will be the last statement of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) on the Armenian genocide in this

body, and I thank the gentleman for all his fine work.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to take note of the tragic occurrences perpetrated on the Armenian people between 1915 and 1923 by the Ottoman Turkish Empire.

During this relatively brief time frame, over 1½ million Armenians were massacred and over 500,000 were exiled. Unfortunately, the Turkish Government still has not recognized these brutal acts as acts of genocide, nor come to terms with its participation in these horrific events.

1645

I believe that by failing to recognize such barbaric acts, one becomes complicit in them. That is why as a New York State assemblyman, I was proud to support legislation adding lessons on human rights and genocide to the State education curricula. I am also a proud cosponsor of H. Res. 398, the United States Training on and Commemoration of the Armenian Genocide Resolution.

H. Res. 398 calls upon the President to provide for appropriate training and materials to all foreign service officers, officials of the Department of State, and any other executive branch employee involved in responding to issues related to human rights, ethnic cleansing, and genocide by familiarizing themselves with the U.S. record relating to the Armenian Genocide.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this very important resolution.

April 24 is recognized as the anniversary date of the Armenian Genocide. The history of this date stretches back to 1915, when on April 24, 300 Armenian leaders, intellectuals and professionals in Constantinople were rounded up, deported and killed, beginning the period known as the Armenian Genocide.

Prior to the Armenian Genocide, these brave people with the history of well over 3,000 years old were subject to numerous indignities and periodic massacres by the Sultans of the Ottoman Empire. The worst of these massacres occurred in 1895 when as many as 300,000 Armenian civilians were brutally massacred and thousands more were left destitute. Additional massacres were committed in 1909 and 1920. By 1922, Armenians had been eradicated from their homeland.

Yet, despite these events, the Armenian people survived as a people and a culture in both Europe and the United States. My congressional district has a number of Armenians, especially in the Woodside community, and their community activism is extraordinary, to say the least.

Mr. Speaker, I make note of this because of a statement by Adolph Hitler when speaking about the "final solution," when he said who remembers the Armenians. Mr. Speaker, I remember the Armenians and so do many of my colleagues speaking here this evening.

ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GUTKNECHT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROGAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join so many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle tonight to rise in support of House Resolution 398 commemorating the Armenian Genocide. House Resolution 398 is a necessary step for our government to take, a recognition of the historical truth of one of history's cruelest acts against a great and good people.

Between 1915 and 1923, over 1 million Armenians whose ancestors had inhabited their homeland since the time of Christ were displaced, deported, tortured and killed at the hands of the Ottoman Empire. Families were slaughtered. Homes were burned. Villages were destroyed and lives were torn apart.

Regrettably in the years since, officials from what is now Turkey have denied this history and failed to recognize the truth, the historical truth of the Armenian Genocide.

Mr. Speaker, as their loved ones were killed, many right before their very eyes, more than 1 million Armenians managed to escape and establish a new life here in the United States. I am honored to have a large portion of the Armenian American community residing in my district in and around Glendale, California.

The Armenian people suffered a horrific tragedy in the first part of the 20th century. Today, our government can work to ensure that the 21st century is a century free both from genocide, and also free from lies.

We must not stray from our work to embrace democracy and build a world that is free from suffering on this immense scale, but that building can never happen as long as we allow one of the worst slaughters in world history to continue to go being unrecognized.

Mr. Speaker, I went through 4 years of college and never once heard about the Armenian Genocide in public schools. We have whole generations of people that have been raised not knowing anything about it because it is not politically correct to teach it in our schools, because we are afraid it might offend an oil-producing Nation with whom we have commercial or military ties.

I just think that that is a wrong-headed approach. It is a disgrace for our Congress. And the purpose of House Resolution 398 is to take a major step toward right and toward morality and recognizing this historical truth.

Today on the eve of the anniversary of the Armenian Genocide, I ask my colleagues to join with our bipartisan group that you have already heard from tonight and will hear from again in support of House Resolution 398 to commemorate the Armenian Genocide.

Having visited the Republic of Armenian and also Nagorno-Karabakh just a

few short months ago, I can attest that the Armenian people have triumphed over tragedy and are building a prosperous democracy. It is a nation that we should be proud to lock arms with and stand with in the greater cause of good, and it is for that reason that I urge my colleagues to join us and support this important resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. HOLT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

JOINT RESOLUTION SUPPORTING DAY OF HONOR 2000

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, first let me certainly acknowledge the eve of the Armenian genocide anniversary and say to my colleagues that all of us should acknowledge such tragic loss of life. But today I rise to introduce a House Joint Resolution, H.J. Res. 98, to designate May 25, 2000, as a national day of honor for minority veterans of World War II.

Seventy-three of my colleagues have already joined me in cosponsoring this resolution. I want to extend my thanks to Senator EDWARD KENNEDY of Massachusetts for joining me by introducing an identical resolution in the United States Senate. I am also very proud that the Day of Honor 2000 Project, a nonprofit organization based in Massachusetts, has helped enlist the support of many Americans to make this resolution possible. In fact, those who are working to propose the World War II veterans memorial here in Washington, D.C. have acknowledged their support for this very special day. Without the support of the Day of Honor Project 2000, this resolution could have never been possible.

The purpose of this joint resolution is to honor and recognize the service of minority veterans in the United States armed forces during World War II. The resolution calls upon communities across the Nation to participate in celebrations to honor minority veterans on May 25, 2000, and throughout the year 2000. Our goal is that the Nation will have an opportunity to pause on May 25, leading up to Memorial

Day, to express our gratitude to the veterans of all minority groups who served the Nation so ably. The day will be special because we honor those who fought for the preservation of democracy and our protection of our way of life.

Unfortunately, many minority veterans never obtained the commensurate recognition that they deserve. We honor all veterans. We certainly honor all veterans in World War II, but it is important to designate and to honor those who during those times as they returned did not receive the fullest of honor. When we look back to the darkest days of World War II we remember and revere the acts of courage and personal sacrifice that each of our soldiers gave to their Nation to achieve Allied victory over Nazism and fascism.

In the 1940s, minorities were utilized in the Allied operation just as any other Americans. My father-in-law in fact was part of the Tuskegee Airmen. Yet we have never adequately recognized the accomplishments of minority veterans. During the war, at least 1.2 million African American citizens either served or sacrificed their lives. In addition, more than 300,000 Hispanic Americans, more than 50,000 Asians, more than 20,000 Native Americans, more than 6,000 native Hawaiians and Pacific islanders, and more than 3,000 native Alaskans also served their country or sacrificed their lives in preserving our freedom during World War II.

Despite the invidious discrimination that many minority veterans were subjected to at home, they fought honorably along with all other Americans including other nations. An African American had to answer the call to duty as others, indeed, possibly sacrifice his life; yet he or she enjoyed a separate but equal status back home. This is something that we can readily correct and with this resolution with the number of cosponsors, I believe that we can move toward seeing this honor come to fruition on the floor of the House.

I would ask my colleagues to readily sign on to H.J. Res. 98 to be able to honor these valiant and valuable members of our society for all that they have done. They are American heroes that deserve recognition for their efforts. For this reason the resolution specifically asks President Clinton to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to honor these minority veterans with appropriate programs and activities. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce a House Joint Resolution 98 to designate May 25, 2000, as a national Day of Honor for minority veterans of World War II. 73 of my colleagues have already joined me in cosponsoring this resolution.

I want to extend my thanks to Senator EDWARD KENNEDY of Massachusetts for joining me by introducing an identical resolution in the U.S. Senate.

I am also very proud that The Day of Honor 2000 Project, a non-profit organization based in Massachusetts, has helped enlist the support of many Americans to make this resolution possible. Without the support of The Day of Honor Project 2000, this resolution could have never been possible.

The purpose of this joint resolution is to honor and recognize the service of minority veterans in the U.S. Armed Forces during World War II. The resolution calls upon communities across the nation to participate in celebrations to honor minority veterans on May 25, 2000, and throughout the year 2000. Our goal is that the nation will have an opportunity to pause on May 25th to express our gratitude to the veterans of all minority groups who served the nation so ably.

The day will be special because we honor those who fought for the preservation of democracy and our protection of our way of life. Unfortunately, many minority veterans never obtained the commensurate recognition that they deserve.

When we look back to darkest days of World War II, we remember and revere the acts of courage and personal sacrifice that each of our soldiers gave to their nation to achieve Allied victory over Nazism and fascism. In the 1940s, minorities were utilized in the allied operations just as any other American.

Yet, we have never adequately recognized the accomplishments of minority veterans. During the war, at least 1,200,000 African Americans citizens either served or sacrificed their lives. In addition, more than 300,000 Hispanic Americans, more than 50,000 Asians, more than 20,000 Native Americans, more than 6,000 Native Hawaiians and Pacific Islanders, and more than 3,000 Native Alaskans also served their country or sacrificed their lives in preserving our freedom during World War II.

Despite the invidious discrimination that most minority veterans were subjected to at home, they fought honorably along with all other Americans, including other nations. An African American had to answer the call to duty, indeed possibly sacrifice his life, yet he or she enjoyed separate but equal status back home.

Too often, when basic issues of equality and respect for their service in the war arose, Jim Crow and racial discrimination replied with a resounding "no." This is a sad but very real chapter of our history.

This all happened, of course, before the emergence of Dr. Martin Luther King, Sr. in America. As a nation, we have long since recognized the unfair treatment of minorities as a travesty of justice. The enactment of fundamental civil rights laws by Congress over the past half-century have remedied the worst of these injustices. And this has given us some hope. But, as we all know, we have yet to give adequate recognition to the service, struggle, and sacrifices of these brave Americans who fought in World War II for our future.

For many of these minority veterans, the memories of World War II never disappear. When we lose a loved one, whether it is a mother, father, sibling, child, or friend, we often sense that we lose a part of ourselves. For each of us, the loss of life—whether expected or not—is not easily surmountable.

Minority veterans had to overcome a great deal after the war. They not only came back

to a nation that did not treat them equally, but they were never recognized for the uniqueness of their efforts during the war. Like of many of us, they adapted to changes or were the engines of social change. But they have suffered and sacrificed so much that few of us will ever understand.

Veterans are dying at a rate of more than 1,000 a day. It is especially important, therefore, for Congress and the administration to do their part now to pay tribute to these men and women who served so valiantly in that conflict.

The minority veterans from World War II represent a significant part of what has been called America's Greatest Generation. They are American heroes that deserve recognition for their efforts. For this reason, the resolution specifically asks President Clinton to issue a proclamation "calling upon the people of the United States to honor these minority veterans with appropriate programs and activities."

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring this resolution.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 98

Whereas World War II was a determining event of the 20th century in that it ensured the preservation and continuation of American democracy;

Whereas the United States called upon all its citizens, including the most oppressed of its citizens, to provide service and sacrifice in that war to achieve the Allied victory over Nazism and fascism;

Whereas the United States citizens who served in that war, many of whom gave the ultimate sacrifice of their lives, included more than 1,200,000 African Americans, more than 300,000 Hispanic Americans, more than 50,000 Asian Americans, more than 20,000 Native Americans, more than 6,000 Native Hawaiians and Pacific Islanders, and more than 3,000 Native Alaskans;

Whereas because of invidious discrimination, many of the courageous military activities of these minorities were not reported and honored fully and appropriately until decades after the Allied victory in World War II;

Whereas the motto of the United States, "E Pluribus Unum" (Out of Many, One), promotes our fundamental unity as Americans and acknowledges our diversity as our greatest strength; and

Whereas the Day of Honor 2000 Project has enlisted communities across the United States to participate in celebrations to honor minority veterans of World War II on May 25, 2000, and throughout the year 2000: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress—

(1) commends the African American, Hispanic American, Asian American, Native American, Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander, Native Alaskan, and other minority veterans of the United States Armed Forces who served during World War II;

(2) especially honors those minority veterans who gave their lives in service to the United States during that war;

(3) supports the goals and ideas of the Day of Honor 2000 in celebration and recognition of the extraordinary service of all minority veterans in the United States Armed Forces during World War II; and

(4) authorizes and requests that the President issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to honor these minority veterans with appropriate programs and activities.

REQUEST TO CLAIM SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim my special order time now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOSSELLA). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

ARMENIAN GENOCIDE COMMEMORATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to talk about the Armenian genocide commemoration. I am going to talk a little bit about Armenia. There are many positive things happening in Armenia today that give us confidence that progress is being made. Armenia has made remarkable, stable strides toward becoming a democratic free market economy even in the face of the setbacks, including the tragic assassinations of Armenian Prime Minister Vazgen Sargsyan and other Parliament members last October. I had gotten to know Mr. Sargsyan before this tragedy and found him to be a man of immense ideas.

It was a tragedy that frankly we all look at with horror. It is behind us now. The government is strong. They have been able to go on in spite of this tragedy, and they have strengthened the situation to a point where it will prevent any future happening of this kind.

Tonight, I would like to talk not so much about what is going on in Armenia and how it is growing but, rather, to talk about a dark period in the remembrance of the genocide that took place back in 1915. When most people hear the word genocide, they immediately think of Hitler and his persecution of the Jews during World War II.

Many individuals are unaware that the first genocide of the 20th century occurred during World War I and was perpetrated by the Ottoman Empire against the Armenian people. Concern that the Armenian people would move to establish their own government, the Ottoman Empire embarked on a reign of terror that resulted in the massacre of over a million and a half Armenians. This atrocious crime, as I mentioned, began on April 15, 1915, when the Ottoman Empire arrested, exiled, and eventually killed hundreds of Armenian religious, political, and intellectual leaders.

Once they had eliminated the Armenian people's leadership, they turned their attention to the Armenians serving in the Ottoman Army. These soldiers were disarmed and placed in labor camps where they were either starved

or executed. The Armenian people, lacking political leadership and deprived of young, able-bodied men who could fight against the Ottoman onslaught were then deported from every region of Turkish Armenia. The images of human suffering from the Armenian genocide are graphic and as haunting as the pictures of the Holocaust.

Why then, it must be asked, are so many people unaware of the Armenian genocide? I believe the answer is found in the international community's response to this disturbing event. At the end of World War I, those responsible for ordering and implementing the Armenian genocide were never brought to justice. And the world casually forgot about the pain and suffering of the Armenian people. This proved to be a grave mistake. In a speech before his invasion of Poland in 1939, Hitler justified his brutal tactics with the infamous statement, "Who today remembers the extermination of the Armenians?"

Six years later, 6 million Jews had been exterminated by the Nazis. Never has the phrase "those who forget the past will be destined to repeat it" been more applicable. If the international community had spoken out against this merciless slaughtering of the Armenian people instead of ignoring it, the horrors of the Holocaust might never have taken place.

As we commemorate the 85th anniversary of the Armenian genocide, I believe it is time to give this event its rightful place in history. This afternoon and this evening, let us pay homage to those who fell victim to the Ottoman oppressors and tell the story of the forgotten genocide. For the sake of the Armenian heritage, it is a story that must be heard.

1700

SPECIAL TRIBUTE TO CENTRALIA COLLEGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOSSELLA). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay special tribute to an outstanding institution of higher education located in Washington's Third Congressional District.

This month we celebrate the 75th anniversary of the founding of Centralia College in Centralia, Washington. Throughout its proud history as the oldest continuously operating community college in the State of Washington, Centralia College has consistently demonstrated a deep commitment to learning. I am proud of Centralia's novel programming and flexible learning options. These features reveal that at Centralia, scholarship is indeed a priority.

In addition to its 44 associate degree and 14 certificate programs, Centralia offers several invaluable courses of

study for the Southwest Washington community. The continuing Education Department provides community classes and business training classes, helping people learn new skills at any age. The workforce training and worker retraining courses teach essential job skills. These skills help the unemployed find new work and they help those facing the possibility of layoffs enhance their existing skills. Centralia also offers farm study and ranch and record keeping study to help our agricultural leaders of today and tomorrow.

One of Centralia's most innovative programs targets gifted high school students. Participation in their "Running Start" program allows 11th and 12th grade students to get the opportunity to take college level classes for both high school and college credit. Not only does this program provide challenges to students to achieve, but it allows them to do so free of charge. Through school district and State payment plans, Centralia ensures that all students get an equal chance to participate.

In addition to providing financial support, Centralia offers other areas to expand access to higher education. Their comprehensive distance learning campaign offers students all of the benefits of attending college, even if they cannot physically attend. From correspondence courses to videotape lectures or telecourses, to on-line classes, to interactive video programs, Centralia will find a way to teach eager students, regardless of their location.

For the 3,000 students enrolled, Centralia's serious educational commitment translates into results. Recently, for example, 9 of the 11 Centralia graduates who interviewed at the Intel company earned positions on the staff. Recruiters of such technology firms regularly visit Centralia, saying they always look forward to seeing the high quality of candidates who come from that college. They go on to say that the students' capability is a reflection of both a high quality college and a high quality electronics department. As we move into the 21st Century, the superiority of Centralia's technology education can only serve to benefit both students and employers.

Another benefit to students emphasized by the Centralia administration, faculty, and staff is diversity. Recognizing the need for students to interact with people of different cultures and backgrounds, Centralia strives to incorporate diversity into its student body and programs wherever possible. The college knows that exposing its students to diverse ideas and people will enhance their educational experience. In today's increasingly close-knit and diverse world, bringing together people from different backgrounds is a necessity, not a luxury.

Mr. Speaker, education is a necessity for all Americans. It prepares young people to face the challenge of the future, and makes the lives of older

Americans more fulfilling. For the past 75 years, Centralia College has prepared its students to be the leaders of tomorrow, and, for that, we all owe Centralia College our gratitude and our congratulations.

I urge my colleagues in the 106th Congress to join me today in paying special tribute to this outstanding college, and may its next 75 years of service be every bit as successful as the first.

REMEMBERING THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE OF 1915-1923

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with those who are taking a few minutes today to remember and pay tribute to those Armenians who lost their lives and national identity during one of history's most tragic examples of persecution and intolerance, the Armenian genocide of 1915 to 1923.

Many Armenians in America, particularly in Indiana, are the children or grandchildren of survivors. In Fort Wayne, we do not have very many Armenians, to be precise, one, sometimes two. But my friend Zohrab Taizan is a classic example of many of the Armenians in America whose family was chased out of Turkey and down into Lebanon, who moved around, having, as a child, to live in a tent, because he saw his family members slaughtered and chased from their homeland; coming over to America where they had a chance to succeed with an American dream, as Armenians actually throughout world history who have been persecuted because of their successes as merchants, and often their very success has led to persecution in many lands that they have been over time. He came to America to the Indiana Institute of Technology, like many other foreign students who came in, learned engineering, and became a very successful engineer in our hometown.

I first saw a slide presentation on the facts of this terrible genocide about 20 years ago when I was a young businessman in Fort Wayne belonging to the Rotary Club. Mr. Zohrab Taizan made a presentation that will forever be burned into my mind about the terrible persecution; not just discrimination and not just random persecution, but the attempt to exterminate an entire people.

The facts, as we have heard a number of times, but I think it is important that we have these burned into our head, on April 24, that is the particular day we commemorate the tragedy, because it marks the beginning of the persecution and ethnic cleansing by the Ottoman Turks.

On April 24, 1915, Armenian political, intellectual, and religious were arrested, forcibly moved from their homeland and killed. The brutality continued against the Armenian people

as families were uprooted from their homes and marched to concentration camps in the desert where they would eventually starve to death.

By 1923, the religious and ideological persecution by the Ottoman Turks resulted in the murder of 1.5 million Armenian men, women, and children and the displacement of an additional 500,000 Armenians. In our lifetime, we have witnessed the brutality and savagery of genocide by despotic regimes seeking to deny people of human rights and religious freedoms. That is Stalin against the Russians, Hitler against the Jews, Mao Tse-tung against the Chinese, Pol Pot against the Cambodians, and Mobutu against the Rwandans.

But genocide has devastating consequences on society as a whole because of the problems created by uprooting entire populations. The survivors become the ones who carry the memory of suffering and the realization that their loved ones are gone. They are the ones who no longer have a home and may feel ideological and spiritual abandonment.

Part of the healing process for Armenian survivors and families of survivors involves the acknowledgment of the atrocity and the admission of wrongdoing by those doing the persecution. It is only through acknowledgment and forgiveness that it is possible to move past the history of the genocide and other sins.

Unfortunately, those responsible for ordering the systematic removal of the Armenians were never brought to justice and the Armenian genocide became a dark moment in history, as we heard earlier, quoted by Hitler and others, who then proceeded to use it as an example to commit genocide on others, to be slowly forgotten by those in America and the international community.

It is important that we remember this tragic event and show strong leadership by denouncing the persecution of people due to their differences in political and religious ideology. By establishing a continuing discourse, we are acknowledging the tragedies of the past and remembering those awful moments in history so they will not be repeated.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank all of my colleagues, those Members who have supported this resolution, as well as all the Armenian organizations in this country and throughout the world who have worked so hard to establish an understanding for their remembrance.

REMEMBERING THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I join my other colleagues today to discuss one of the greatest unrecognized tragedies

of the 20th Century, you have heard it by the previous speakers, that is the Armenian genocide.

April 24th marks the 85th anniversary of the start of the first genocide of the 1900's. Before the Holocaust there was the Armenian genocide. It took place between 1915 and 1923 in the Ottoman Empire.

In April of 1915, a weak Ottoman Empire ordered mass deportations of Armenians. This was carried out swiftly and systematically on official orders from the government of the Ottoman Empire. Forced marches resulted in the deaths of over 1 million Armenians. Armenian men of military age were rounded up, marched for several miles and shot dead throughout eastern Anatolia. Women, children, and the elderly, many subjected to rape, were forced to leave their homeland and move to relocation centers in the Syrian desert. During these long marches, no food, water, or shelter was provided. Many died of disease or exhaustion, and survivors were subjected to forcible conversion to Islam.

The annihilation of such a large portion of Armenians in the Ottoman Empire led to the loss of many lives and the dream of an Armenian homeland. Surviving Armenians fled to the then Soviet Union, the United States, and other parts of the world in pursuit of their basic freedoms. Many Armenians live and work in my congressional district in San Diego. Their history and story need to be shared and embraced.

Today, our NATO ally, Turkey, has repeatedly denied the execution of over 1 million Armenians. The denial of this atrocity has proved beneficial for Turkey's foreign policy. The murder of Armenians, a massacre based on cultural and religious beliefs, goes on officially unnoticed, and the United States maintains a favorable relationship and strategic partnership with Turkey.

Mr. Speaker, because of these reasons, I have joined my colleagues in co-sponsoring House Resolution 398, the United States Training on and Commemoration of the Armenian Genocide Resolution. This resolution provides training and educational materials to all Foreign Service and State Department officials concerning the Armenian genocide.

It is time for our country to stand up and recognize this tragic event. When Hitler conceived of the idea to exterminate the Jewish population, he noted the lack of consequences by saying, "Who, after all, speaks today of the annihilation of the Armenians?"

Mr. Speaker, today I and my colleagues speak of the annihilation of the Armenians, and we ask our other colleagues to join in this cause. The story of the Armenian genocide, the forgotten genocide, deserves to be told and understood. We owe it to the Armenians. We owe it to mankind.

COMMEMORATING THE 85TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 85th anniversary of the start of the Armenian genocide, one of the most horrific episodes of human history.

In early 1915, Britain and Russia launched major offensives intended to knock the Ottoman Empire out of the first World War. In the east, Russian forces inflicted massive losses on the Ottomans, who reacted by lashing out at the Armenians, whom they accused of undermining the Empire.

On April 24, 1915, the Turkish government began to arrest Armenian community and political leaders suspected of harboring nationalist sentiments. Most of those arrested were executed without ever being charged with crimes.

The government then moved to deport most Armenians from eastern Anatolia, ordering that they resettle in what is now Syria. Many deportees never reached that destination. The U.S. Ambassador in Constantinople at the time, Henry Morgenthau, wrote "When the Turkish authorities gave the orders for these deportations, they were merely giving the death warrant to a whole race."

From 1915 to 1918, more than a million Armenians died of starvation or disease on long marches, or were massacred outright by Turkish forces. From 1918 to 1923, Armenians continued to suffer at the hands of the Turkish military, which eventually removed all remaining Armenians from Turkey.

We mark this anniversary each year because this horrible tragedy for the Armenian people was a tragedy for all humanity. We must remember, speak out and teach future generations about the horrors of genocide and the oppression and terrible suffering endured by the Armenian people.

Sadly, genocide is not yet a vestige of the past. In recent years we have witnessed the "killing fields" of Cambodia, mass ethnic killings in Bosnia and Rwanda, and "ethnic cleansing" in Kosovo. We must renew our commitment to remain vigilant and prevent such assaults on humanity from occurring ever again.

Even as we remember the tragedy and honor the dead, we also honor the living. Out of the ashes of their history, Armenians all over the world have clung to their identity and prospered in new communities. Hundreds of thousands of Armenians live in California, where they form a strong and vibrant community. The strength they have displayed in overcoming tragedy to flourish in this country is an example for all of us.

Surrounded by countries hostile to them, to this day the Armenian struggle continues. But now with an independent Armenian state, the United States has the opportunity to contribute to a true memorial to the past by strengthening Armenia's emerging democracy. We must do all we can through aid and trade to support Armenia's efforts to construct an open political and economic system.

Adolf Hitler, the architect of the Nazi Holocaust, once remarked "Who remembers the Armenians?" The answer is, we do. And we will continue to remember the victims of the

1915–23 genocide because, in the words of the philosopher George Santayana, "Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it."

SAY NO TO COMMERCIAL WHALING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. METCALF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, 2 days ago a mighty 35-foot long gray whale washed up on the beach in front of my home on Whidbey Island in Washington State. As a vociferous opponent of killing whales or the expansion of whaling worldwide, and as a lifelong advocate for the environmental health of Puget Sound, this recent event has been the cause of some amount of discussion and publicity in the region surrounding my district. Out of the 1,000 miles of coastline in Washington State, it was certainly an interesting coincidence that the body lodged right on the beach in front of my house.

The death of this gray whale should call our attention to those who would like to reverse the will expressed in Congress and by an overwhelming majority of the American people who oppose allowing the hunting of whales, particularly for commercial purposes.

As I have been predicting from the well of this House and across America for several years, the push for resumption of worldwide commercial whaling is on in earnest. And it is not about heritage, it is all about money. We have heard that a gray whale can be sold in Japan for \$1 million.

Those who want to end the ban on commercial whaling have been using the pretext of restoring whaling rights to indigenous people to expand the scope of whaling worldwide. But if we allow people to use the excuse of historic whale hunting for resumption of whale hunting worldwide, you have got to remember many nations, most nations with coastlines, hunted whales. Japan and Norway definitely would have, as good as anybody, an historic whale hunting opportunity. Japan and Norway are the most notorious now for going ahead and hunting whales.

Newsweek Magazine reported, April 17, information I have already given this body that Japan has been quietly packing the International Whaling Commission with small nations willing to do their bidding, willing to vote for the resumption of commercial whaling.

Mr. Speaker, we are dangerously close to a renewal of the barbaric practice of commercial whaling. To millions of Americans, including myself, this is totally unacceptable. When the Clinton-Gore administration last year financed the Makah tribal whale hunt and colluded with the pro-whaling nations of the International Whaling Commission, our Nation's government lost its moral authority to lead the fight against killing whales for profit.

1715

This was truly a tragedy. Whales were hunted almost to extinction in the late 1800s.

Mr. Speaker, we must not allow the clock to be turned back to past days of barbarism. Republicans and Democrats in this body must stand with the American people and stop this conspiracy against these magnificent creatures. We must not return to commercial whaling.

THE 85TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOSSELLA). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in commemoration of the 85th anniversary of the Armenian Genocide, a horrible period in our history that took the lives of 1.5 million Armenians and led to the exile of the Armenian nation from its historic homeland.

My colleagues and I join with the Armenian-American community, and with Armenians throughout the world, to remember one of the darkest periods in the history of humankind. We owe this commemoration to those who perished because of the senseless hatred of others, and we need this commemoration because it is the only way to prevent such events in the future.

We have already learned the lessons of forgetting. The Armenian Genocide, which began 15 years after the start of the twentieth century, was the first act of genocide this century, but it was far from the last. The indifference of the world to the slaughter of 1.5 million Armenians laid the foundation for other acts of genocide, including the Holocaust, Stalin's purges, and, most recently, ethnic cleansing in Kosovo.

The lessons of the destruction that results when hatred is left unchecked have been too slowly learned. The world's indifference to the Armenian Genocide proved to Adolf Hitler that his plans to annihilate the Jewish people would encounter little opposition and would spur no global outcry. The post-Holocaust directive "zachor," remember—lest history repeat itself, came too late for 1.5 million Armenians and 6 million Jews. It came too late for millions of victims around the world.

Today we recall the Armenian Genocide and we mourn its victims. But we also renew our pledge to the Armenian nation to do everything we can to prevent further aggression, and we renew our commitment to ensuring that Armenians throughout the world can live free of threats to their existence and prosperity.

Unfortunately, we still have to work toward this simple goal. Azerbaijan continues to blockade Armenia and Nagorno-Karabagh, denying the Armenian people the food, medicine, and other humanitarian assistance they need to lead secure, prosperous lives. And as long as this immoral behavior continues, I pledge to join my colleagues in continuing to send the message to Azerbaijan that harming civilians is an unacceptable means for resolving disputes.

Mr. Speaker, after the Genocide, the Armenian people wiped away their tears and cried

out, "Let us always remember the atrocities that have taken the lives of our parents and our children and our neighbors."

As the Armenian-American author William Saroyan wrote, "Go ahead, destroy this race . . . Send them from their homes into the desert . . . Burn their homes and churches. Then see if they will not laugh again, see if they will not sing and pray again. For, when two of them meet anywhere in the world, see if they will not create a New Armenia."

I rise today to remember those cries, and to pay tribute to the resilience of the Armenian people, who have contributed so much to our world. Those who have perished deserve our commemoration, and they also deserve our pledge to ensure that such a horrific chapter in history is never repeated again.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DIAZ-BALART addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE NATIONAL MUSEUM OF THE AMERICAN INDIAN COMMEMORATIVE COIN ACT OF 2000

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, my home State of Oklahoma has a strong heritage in our Nation's Native American history and culture. In fact, the name "Oklahoma" means "Land of the Red People" in the Choctaw language. So nowhere else in this country is there more appreciation than in Oklahoma that a museum dedicated to preserving this legacy is being constructed in Washington, D.C.

The National Museum of the American Indian was established as an act of Congress in 1989 to serve as a permanent repository of Native American culture. The groundbreaking took place in September of 1999, and it is scheduled to open in the summer of 2002.

Because of the historic significance and importance of this museum to the people of Oklahoma, I am introducing a bill today that will commemorate its opening. The National Museum of the American Indian Commemorative Coin Act of 2000 will call for the minting of a special \$1 silver coin intended to raise funds for the museum and celebrate its completion.

As part of the highly respected Smithsonian institution, which is now the world's largest museum complex, the National Museum of the American Indian will collect, preserve, and exhibit Native American objects of artistic, historical, literary, anthropological, and scientific interest. Also important is that it will provide for Native American research and study programs.

The coin my bill proposes will be of proof quality and be minted only in the

year 2001. Sales of the coin could continue until the date that the stock is depleted. The coin would be of no net cost to the American taxpayer, and the proceeds from its sale will go towards funding the opening of the National Museum of the American Indian. The proceeds would also help supplement the museum's endowment and educational outreach funds.

Based on past sales of coins of this nature, we are likely perhaps to raise roughly in the range of \$3.5 million for the museum. The coin will be modeled after the original 5 cent buffalo nickel designed by James Earl Fraser and minted from 1913 to 1938, which portrays a profile representation of a Native American on the obverse, and an American buffalo, American bison, on the coin's reverse side.

Mr. Speaker, as an Oklahoman, I was proud to have led the effort in Congress to designate the Roger Mills County site of the November, 1868 Battle of the Washita, yes, some might more accurately describe it as a massacre, as a national historic site. This site in Western Oklahoma, where Lieutenant Colonel George Custer and the 7th U.S. cavalry attacked the Cheyenne Peace Chief Black Kettle's village.

Now I am pleased to introduce the National Museum of the American Indian Commemorative Coin Act of 2000. A like version of this bill is already making its way through the Senate, having been introduced there by United States Senator BEN Nighthorse Campbell of Colorado and Senator DANIEL Inouye of Hawaii.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my fellow colleagues in the House to take this opportunity to recognize the importance to our Nation of the National Museum of the American Indian by becoming a cosponsor of my bill.

ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to speak about one of the 20th century's early atrocities, the Armenian genocide. It is a subject that is very near and dear to my heart as my own grandfather was a witness to the bloodshed firsthand.

While the genocide began well before the turn of the past century, April 24 marks an important date that we as citizens and human beings need to remember. It was when 254 Armenian intellectuals were arrested by Turkish authorities in Istanbul and taken to the provinces of Ayash and Chankiri, where many of them were later massacred.

Throughout the genocide, Turkish authorities ordered the evacuations of Armenians out of villages in Turkish Armenia and Asia Minor. As the villages were evacuated, men were often shot immediately. Women and children were forced to walk limitless distances

to the south where, if they survived, many were raped and put into concentration camps. Prisoners were starved, beaten, and murdered by unmerciful guards.

This was not a case for everyone, though. Not everyone was sent to concentration camps. For example, many innocent people were put on ships and then thrown overboard into the Black Sea.

The atrocities of the Armenian genocide were still being carried out in 1921 when Kemalists were found abusing and starving prisoners to death. In total, approximately 1.5 million Armenians were killed in a 28-year period. This does not include the half million or more who were forced to leave their homes and flee to foreign countries.

Together with Armenians all over the world and people of conscience, I would like to honor those who lost their homes, their freedom, and their lives during this dark period.

Many survivors of the genocide came to the United States seeking a new beginning, my grandfather among them. The experiences of his childhood fueled his desire for freedom for his Armenian homeland in the First World War, so he returned there, where he was awarded two Russian Medals of Honor for bravery in the fight against fascism.

It is important that we not forget about these terrible atrocities, because as Winston Churchill said, those who do not learn from the past are destined to repeat it.

Since the atrocity, Armenia has taken great strides, achieving its independence over 8 years ago. Then it was a captive Nation struggling to preserve its centuries-old traditions and customs. Today the Republic of Armenia is an independent, freedom-loving Nation and a friend of the United States and to the democratic world.

Monday, April 24, will mark the 85th anniversary of one of the most gruesome human atrocities in the 20th century. Sadly, it was the systematic killing of 1.5 million Armenian men and women. Ironically, Mr. Speaker, it was none other than Adolph Hitler who began to immortalize the Armenian atrocities when he, questioning those who were questioning his own determination to commit his own atrocities and his own genocide, he said, After all, who will remember the Armenians?

As we do not ignore the occurrence of the Nazi Holocaust, we must not ignore the Armenian genocide. Many people across the world will concede this is a very tender and difficult event to discuss, but in order for us to discontinue the mistakes of the past we must never forget it happened, and we must never stop speaking out against such horrors.

As a strong and fervent supporter of the Republic of Armenia, I am alarmed that the Turkish government is still refusing to acknowledge what happened and instead is attempting to rewrite history. It is vital that we do not let political agendas get in the way of doing what is right.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon the Turkish government to accept complete accountability for the Armenian genocide. To heal the wounds of the past, the Turkish government must first recognize its responsibility for the actions of past leaders. Nothing we can do or say will bring back those who perished, but we can honor those who lost their homes, their freedom, their lives, by teaching future generations the lessons of this atrocity.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my special order tonight, which is the Armenian genocide.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, as my colleagues and I do every year at this time, in a proud but solemn tradition to remember and pay tribute to the victims of one of history's worst crimes against humanity, the Armenian genocide of 1915 to 1923.

This evening my colleagues will be discussing various aspects of this tragedy, including what actually happened, how it affected the victims, the survivors and their descendants, how the perpetrators and their descendants have responded, the reaction of the United States and other major nations, and what lessons the Armenian genocide teaches us today.

Since we are constrained by time limitations, I will also be submitting for the RECORD some additional information.

Mr. Speaker, the Armenian genocide was the systematic extermination, the murder of 1.5 Armenian men, women, and children during the Ottoman Turkish empire. This is of the first genocide of the 20th century, but sadly, not the last. Sadder still, at the dawn of the 21st century we continue to see the phenomenon of genocide. Such is the danger of ignoring or forgetting the lessons of the Armenian genocide.

April 24 marks the 85th anniversary of the unleashing of the Armenian genocide. On that dark day in 1915, some 200 Armenian religious, political, and intellectual leaders from the Turkish capital of Constantinople, now Istanbul, were arrested and exiled in one fell swoop, silencing the leading representatives of the Armenian community in the Ottoman capital.

This was the beginning of the genocide. Over the years from 1915 to 1923, millions of men, women, and children

were deported, forced into slave labor, and tortured by the government of the Young Turk Committee, and 1.5 million of them were killed.

The deportations and killings finally ended with the establishment of the Republic of Turkey in 1923, although efforts to erase all traces of the Armenian presence in the area continued. To this day, the Republican of Turkey refuses to acknowledge the fact that this massive crime against humanity took place on soil under its control and in the name of Turkish nationalism.

Not only does Turkey deny that the genocide ever took place, it has mounted an aggressive effort to try to present an alternative and false version of history, using its extensive financial and lobbying resources in this country.

Recently the Turkish government signed a \$1.8 million contract for the lobbying services of three very prominent former members of this House to argue Turkey's case in the halls of power here in Washington. While the major focus of their efforts is trying to secure a \$4 billion attack helicopter sale, two of these lobbyists and former Congressmen, according to the April 8 edition of the National Journal, were recently here on Capitol Hill trying to persuade leaders of this House not to support legislation affirming U.S. recognition of the genocide.

Mr. Speaker, the sponsors of that legislation, House Resolution 398, the gentleman from California (Mr. RADANOVICH) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR), will also be speaking tonight. I want to praise them for taking the lead on this bipartisan initiative which currently has 38 cosponsors and which has obviously caused some concern within the Turkish government.

I regret to say that the United States still does not officially recognize the Armenian genocide. Bowing to strong pressure from Turkey, the U.S. State Department and American presidents of both parties have for more than 15 years shied away from referring to the tragic events of 1915 through 1923 by the word "genocide", thus minimizing and not accurately conveying what really happened beginning 85 years ago.

This legislation is an effort to address this shameful lapse in our own Nation's record as a champion of human rights and historical fact.

Mr. Speaker, the Armenian people are united in suffering and the spirit of remembrance with the Jewish people, who were, of course, also the victims of genocide in the 20th century. I wanted to cite a letter from Mrs. Rima Feller-Varzhapetyan, president of the Jewish community of Armenia.

In a letter to the Congress of the United States, which I will submit for the RECORD, Mrs. Varzhapetyan wrote, "Had the world recognized and condemned the genocide at the time, it is unlikely that the word Holocaust would have become known to the Jewish people."

She also states, "We believe that what happened to Armenians at the beginning of the century is not an issue

for only Armenians. It is a cruel crime against humanity." She concludes, "Believing that Turkey's membership in the European Union should require its acknowledgment of responsibility for the Armenian genocide, which will benefit the Turkish people as well, the Jewish community of Armenia urges the Congress of the United States to speak up in support of the interests of the Armenians, and to recognize the genocide of Armenians as they recognize the Jewish Holocaust."

Mr. Speaker, there is additional information that I will include in my statement for the RECORD, but I wanted to conclude by praising the work of the Armenian American community in keeping the flame of memory burning. This week members of the Armenian Assembly of America held an advocacy day on Capitol Hill in which they urged the Members of Congress on several key issues, including the recognition of the genocide.

On Sunday, April 16, the annual commemoration will be held in Times Square in New York City, and on Tuesday, May 2, after Congress returns from our spring recess, the Armenian National Committee will host the sixth annual Capitol Hill observance and reception marking the anniversary of the genocide.

I am pleased to report that the Armenian Assembly has recently acquired a building not far from the White House here in Washington to use as the future site of the Armenian Genocide Museum.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the letter from Ms. Varzhapetyan.

The letter referred to is as follows:

JEWISH COMMUNITY OF ARMENIA,
REPUBLIC OF ARMENIA,
Yerevan 375051, 2/1 Griboyedov St., off. 49.
Congress of The United States of America

On 24 April, 2000, 85-th anniversary of the Genocide of Armenians—a horrifying crime, which occurred at the beginning of this century—will be commemorated.

Had the world recognized and condemned the Genocide at the time, it is unlikely that the word Holocaust would have become known to the Jewish people. Today the world is not safeguarded against genocide. It can be repeated anywhere in the world.

We believe that what happened to Armenians at the beginning of the century is not an issue for only Armenians. It is a cruel crime against humanity.

Taking into consideration that the Armenian Genocide was recognized by the United Nations Human Rights Subcommission in 1985, that it was recognized by member states of the European Union in 1987, and by the Ottoman military tribunal in 1919, the Jewish Community of Armenia believes that the recognition of the 1915-1923 Armenian Genocide will positively impact the resolution of a number of issues in the Caucasus.

Believing that Turkey's membership in the European Union should require its acknowledgment of responsibility for the Armenian Genocide—which will benefit the Turkish people as well—the Jewish Community of Armenia urges Congress of The United States of America to speak up in support of the interests of the Armenians and to recognize the Genocide of Armenians, as they recognized the Jewish Holocaust.

RIMA VARZHAPETYAN,
Chairman of the JCA.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of the one and a half million Armenians who perished in the Armenian Genocide of 1915-1923.

The Armenian Genocide was one of the most awful events in history. It was a horrible precedent for other twentieth-century genocides—from Nazi Germany to Cambodia, Bosnia, and Rwanda.

This great tragedy is commemorated each year on April 24. On that day in 1915 hundreds of Armenian leaders in Constantinople were rounded up to be deported and killed.

In the following years, Ottoman officials expelled millions of Armenians from homelands they had inhabited for over 2,500 years. Families—men, women, and children—were driven into the desert to die of starvation, disease, and exposure. Survivors tell of harrowing forced marches and long journeys packed into cattle cars like animals. In 1915, the New York Times carried reports of families burned alive in wooden houses or chained together and drowned in Lake Van.

Mr. Speaker, the murder of innocent children can never be an act of self-defense, as the Ottomans claimed. As Henry Morgenthau, Sr., the United States Ambassador to Turkey, cabled to the U.S. Department in 1915, the actions of the Ottoman Government constituted "a campaign of race extermination * * * under pretence of a reprisal against rebellion."

Documents in the archives of the United States, Britain, France, Austria, the Vatican, and other nations confirm Ambassador Morgenthau's assessment. While the Turkish government claims it resources show otherwise, Turkey has never opened its archives to objective scholars.

It is time for the world to deal honestly and openly with this great blemish on our common history.

The United States can be proud of its role in opposing the genocide while it was taking place.

Ambassador Morgenthau, with State Department approval, collected witness accounts and other evidence of atrocities, calling international attention to the genocide. A Concurrent Resolution of the United States Senate encouraged the President to set aside a day of sympathy for Armenian victims. Congress and President Wilson chartered the organization of Near East Relief, which provided over \$100 million in aid for Armenian survivors and led to the adoption of 132,000 Armenian orphans as foster children in the United States.

Yet the international community failed to take decisive action against the criminals who planned and instigated this tragedy.

After World War I, courts-martial sentenced the chief organizers of the Armenian Genocide to death, but the verdicts of the courts were not enforced. International standards were not asserted to hold Ottoman officials accountable.

I have cosponsored legislation that would help redress this tragedy.

H. Res. 398 would take steps to ensure that all Foreign Service officers and other United States officials dealing with human rights issues are familiar with the Armenian Genocide and the consequences of the failure to enforce judgments on the responsible officials.

It would also recognize the seriousness of these events by calling on the President to refer to the deaths of 1.5 million Armenians following 1915 as "genocide."

In 1939, when Adolf Hitler was issuing orders for German "Death Units" to murder Polish and Jewish men, women, and children, he noted, "After all, who remembers the extermination of the Armenians?"

Mr. Speaker, the Congress of the United States remembers the Armenians. I urge my colleagues to join me in condemning genocide and honoring the memory of 1.5 million innocent victims. Cosponsor H. Res. 398.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to join with so many of my colleagues in recalling the horrors visited upon the Armenian people and to take a stand against those who would deny the past in order to shape the future. The Armenian Genocide, which occurred between 1915 and 1923, resulted in the deliberate death of 1.5 million human souls, killed for the crime of their own existence.

A shocking forerunner of still greater slaughter to come in the 20th century, the Armenian Genocide marked a critical point in history, when technology and ideology combined with the power of the state to make war on an entire people. The Ottoman Empire's campaign to eliminate the whole of the Armenian population existing within its borders was no accident, no mistake made by a minor functionary. Genocide was official policy and 1.5 million corpses were the result. The innocent, the harmless, the blameless, without regard to age, sex or status, they were the victims of deportation, starvation and massacre.

When we here, in the House of Representatives, recall the deaths of the innocent of Armenia, we stand as witnesses to history and recognize the common bond of humanity. We acknowledge not just Armenians, but all the victims of vicious nationalism, ethnic and religious hatred, and pathological ideologies. The double tragedy of the Armenian Genocide, is first, that 1.5 million lives were snuffed out, and second, that the world, including the United States, not only did nothing, but again stood by as genocide took place on an even vaster scale across Europe only 16 years later.

"Never again." This is the simple lesson we as a nation have learned from the unprecedented slaughter of the innocent in the last century. Our armed forces are serving nobly around the world to make this dictum more than just words. If we are to be a just and honorable nation, we must do more than shrug our shoulders at atrocities. We, as a nation, must bear witness to history, and having acknowledged the horrors of the past, commit ourselves to preventing their repetition.

Mr. Speaker, I am here today for one simple reason: to recall publicly that eighty-five years ago one-third of the Armenian people were put to death for the crime of their own existence. To deny this reality is to murder them again. We can not, we must not, allow their deaths to be stripped of meaning by allowing the crime committed against them to slowly slip into the mists of lost memory.

Thanks to the strength and commitment of America's citizens of Armenian descent, their memory will not be lost. The victims of the Armenian Genocide will not be forgotten. I'd also like to commend and thank my colleagues Congressmen JOHN PORTER and FRANK PALLONE, the co-chairmen of the Congressional Caucus of Armenian Issues. Thanks to their leadership, this House has again honorably fulfilled America's commitment to memory and justice.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am honored that my colleagues have invited me to join in today's special order commemorating the tragic events that began in 1915.

I know how important this commemoration is to those Armenian-Americans descended from the survivors of the massacres carried out during World War I, almost eighty-five years ago.

Indeed, hundreds of thousands of Armenians died at that time as a result of brutal actions taken by the Turkish Ottoman Empire.

While the men and women who died during those tragic days would not live to see it, the Armenian nation has now re-emerged, despite the suffering its people endured under the Ottoman Empire and during the following eight decades of communist dictatorship under the former Soviet Union.

As I have said before, the independent state of Armenia stands today as clear proof that indeed the Armenian people have survived the challenges of the past—and will survive the challenges of the future as well.

Through assistance and diplomatic support, the United States is helping Armenia to build a new future.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join us in looking to the past and in commemorating those hundreds of thousands of innocents who lost their lives some eighty-five years ago.

Mr. DOOLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in remembrance of the Armenian Genocide.

This terrible human tragedy must not be forgotten. Like the Holocaust, the Armenian Genocide stands as a tragic example of the human suffering that results from hatred and intolerance.

One and a half million Armenian people were massacred by the Ottoman Turkish Empire between 1915 and 1923. More than 500,000 Armenians were exiled from a homeland that their ancestors had occupied for more than 3,000 years. A race of people was nearly eliminated.

It would be an even greater tragedy to forget that the Armenian Genocide ever happened. To not recognize the horror of such events almost assures their repetition in the future. Adolf Hitler, in preparing his genocide plans for the Jews, predicted that no one would remember the atrocities he was about to unleash. After all, he asked, "Who remembers the Armenians?"

Our statements today are intended to preserve the memory of the Armenian loss, and to remind the world that the Turkish government—to this day—refuses to acknowledge the Armenian Genocide. The truth of this tragedy can never and should never be denied.

And we must also be mindful of the current suffering of the Armenian, where the Armenian people are still immersed in tragedy and violence. The unrest between Armenia and Azerbaijan continues in Nagorno-Karabakh. Thousands of innocent people have already perished in this dispute, and many more have been displaced and are homeless.

In the face of this difficult situation we have an opportunity for reconciliation. Now is the time for Armenia and its neighbors to come together and work toward building relationships that will assure lasting peace.

Meanwhile, in America, the Armenian-American community continues to thrive and to provide assistance and solidarity to its country-

men and women abroad. The Armenian-American community is bound together by strong generational and family ties, an enduring work ethic and a proud sense of ethnic heritage. Today we recall the tragedy of their past, not to place blame, but to answer a fundamental question, "Who remembers the Armenians?"

Our commemoration of the Armenian Genocide speaks directly to that, and I answer, we do.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 85th anniversary of the Armenian Genocide.

After decades of ethnic and religious persecution, Armenians living within the Ottoman Empire joined together with the purpose of restoring freedom and self-determination to the Armenian people. In retaliation, the Sultan ordered the mass deportation of over 1,750,000 Armenians from their villages and homes and towards Mesopotamia. They left behind all they had known for a dozen generations and began a horrifying trek across an uninhabitable desert. These innocent families were either slaughtered by their captors, or died from dehydration and exhaustion by the hundreds of thousands. An estimated 1,500,000 men, women and children died during the course of this deadly exodus.

This upcoming April 24 we will pause, as we do each year, to remember those innocents who were so viciously murdered. We will join with all Armenian Americans and Armenians throughout the world in recognizing this horrifying genocide of their people, and by remembering we will make the promise to Armenians everywhere that this atrocity will never be repeated.

I have introduced H. Res. 398, commemorating the Armenian Genocide Resolution and insuring that no one further will deny this brutal chapter in human history. I ask that you join with me as I express my profound sorrow for the lost lives of millions, and as I celebrate the lives of their children and grandchildren who live on today. For by honoring the living, we most faithfully remember those who suffered a merciless death in the desert some 85 years ago.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I want to lend my voice to this important debate remembering the Armenian Genocide. While Turkey's brutal campaign against the Armenian people was initiated almost a century ago, its impact lives on in the hearts of all freedom-loving people. That is why we must continue to speak about it. We must remind the American people of the potential for such atrocities against ethnic groups, because history lessons that are not learned are too often repeated.

After suffering three decades of persecution, deportation and massacre under the Ottoman Turks, the Armenian people were relieved when the brutal reign of Ottoman Turks Sultan Abdul Hamid came to an end in 1908. But that relief was short-lived, as the successor Young Turk dictators were working on a far more aggressive plan to deal with the Armenian people. By 1914, they were laying plans to eliminate the country's minorities—starting with the Armenian people. Segregating Armenians in the military, the Turks were able to work these

people to death. That year, the government also organized other military units comprised of convicts for the express purpose of annihilating Armenian people.

By the spring of 1915, the Turkish dictators were ready to execute their final solution: they began ordering massive deportation and massacres of Armenian people. April 24 marked the fruition of this plan, with the murder of nearly 200 Armenian religious, political and intellectual leaders—which set off the full scale campaign to eliminate the Armenian people. Men, women, and children alike were subjected to torture, starvation and brutal death—and every kind of unspeakable act against humanity—in the name of Turkish ethnic cleansing. 1.5 million Armenian people perished at the hands of this brutal regime.

The U.S. has some of the most extensive documentation of this genocide against the Armenian people, but there has been no shortage of corroboration by other countries. The Armenian genocide has been recognized by the United Nations and around the globe, and the U.S. came to the aid of the survivors. But perhaps we were not vociferous enough in holding the perpetrators of this genocide accountable, and for shining the light of international shame upon them. For it was only a few decades later that we saw another genocide against humanity: the Holocaust. That is why we must continue to tell the story of Armenian genocide. It is a painful reminder that such vicious campaigns against a people have occurred, and that the potential for such human brutality exists in this world. We must remain mindful of the continued repression of Armenians today, and challenge those who would persecute these people. If we do not, future generations may be destined to relive such horrors against humanity.

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of those who lost their lives during the Armenian Genocide.

The Armenians are an ancient people, having inhabited the highland region between the Black, Caspian, and Mediterranean seas for almost 3,000 years. Armenia was sometimes independent under its national dynasties, autonomous under native princes, or subjected to foreign rulers. The Armenians were among the first groups of people to adopt Christianity and to have developed a distinct national-religious culture.

Turkey invaded Armenia in the beginning of the 11th century, AD and conquered the last Armenian kingdom three centuries later. Most of the territories which had formed the medieval Armenian kingdoms were incorporated into the Ottoman Empire in the 16th century. While the Armenians were included in the Ottoman Empire's multi-national and multi-religious state, they suffered discrimination, special taxes, prohibition to bear arms, and other second-class citizenship status.

In spite of these restrictions, Armenians lived in relative peace until the late 1800's. When the Ottoman Empire started to strain under the weight of internal corruption and external challenges, the government increased oppression and intolerance against Armenians. The failure of the Ottoman system to prevent the further decline of its empire led to the overthrow of the government by a group of reformists known as the Young Turks. It would be under the Young Turks' rule between 1915 and 1918 that Armenians would be forcibly taken from their homeland and killed.

Hundreds of thousands of Armenian men were rounded up and deported to Syria by way of train and forced caravan marches. Armenian women and children were subjected to indescribable cruelties prior to losing their lives as well. While many Armenians survived the conditions of the packed cattle cars, they did not survive the Syrian desert. Killed by bandits or conditions from desert heat and exhaustion, most victims of the forced caravan marches did not even reach the killing centers in Syria. While others perished in the concentration camps in the Syrian desert where disease, starvation, and other health conditions brought about their demise.

This genocide, which was preceded by a series of massacres in 1894–1896 and in 1909 and was followed by another series of massacres in 1920, essentially dispersed Armenians and removed them from their historic homeland. The persecution of the Armenian people has left psychological scars among the survivors and their families. No person should have to endure the trauma and horrors that they have.

On May 2, 1995, I had the honor of meeting the former Armenian Ambassador to the United States, Rouben Robert Shugarian, at a Congressional reception commemorating the 80th anniversary of the Armenian genocide. Ambassador Shugarian introduced me to several survivors of the 1915 genocide. This experience was a deeply moving and personal reminder of the 1.5 million Armenians who perished during the systematic extermination by the Ottoman Empire.

It is important that we not only commemorate the Armenian Genocide, but honor the memory of those who lost their lives during this time. We must never forget this horrific and shameful time in world history so that it will never be repeated again.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in commemorating the 85th anniversary of the Armenian Genocide.

The spirits of 1.5 million Armenian men, women and children who perished at the hands of the Ottoman Turks cry out for justice. The collective weight of their deaths hangs like the Sword of Damocles over Turkey's refusal to recognize the sins of its past.

Mr. Speaker, eighty-five years after the brutal decapitation of the political, religious and economic leadership of Armenian society; eighty-five years after the forced marches of starvation; eighty-five years after its genocidal campaign against its Armenian population, the Turkish Government continues to deny the undeniable.

Mr. Speaker, the Armenian Genocide is an historical fact—a fact that has been indelibly etched in the annals of history. It cannot be wiped away from our collective conscience. It cannot be denied. The systematic slaughter of 1.5 million Armenians stands as one of the darkest and bloodiest chapters of the twentieth century. From 1915 to 1923, the government of the Ottoman Empire carried out a calculated policy of mass extermination against its Armenian citizens.

The Turkish Government has a moral obligation to acknowledge the Armenian Genocide. Just as Germany has come to grips and atoned for the Jewish Holocaust, Turkey must recognize and atone for the Armenian Genocide. To heal the open wounds of the past, Turkey must come to terms with its past. Turkey must also come to terms with its present

hostile actions against the Republic of Armenia.

Mr. Speaker, the Government of Turkey should immediately lift its illegal blockade of Armenia. In addition, Turkey must stop obstructing the delivery of United States humanitarian assistance to Armenia. This is not only unconscionable but it also damages American-Turkish relations. Turkey is indeed an important ally of the United States. However, until Turkey faces up to its past and stops its silent but destructive campaign against the republic of Armenia, United States-Turkey relations will not rise to their full potential.

Mr. Speaker, the United States must continue to be a strong ally of Armenia. We must target our assistance to promote Armenian trade, long-term economic self-sufficiency, and Democratic pluralism. We must also continue to support section 907 of the Freedom Support Act, which is aimed at penalizing countries like Azerbaijan that prevent the transshipment of United States humanitarian relief through their territory.

Finally, our government must speak with one voice when it comes to the matter of the Armenian Genocide. While Congress has used the word genocide to describe the actions of the Ottoman Government against its Armenian population, the United States Government has not been as forthcoming. It is time for the President to put diplomatic niceties and Turkish sensitivities aside, and speak directly to the American people and to the world. Genocide is the only word that does justice to the memory of 1.5 million Armenian men, women and children that were victimized by the implementation of a deliberate, premeditated plan to eliminate them as a people from the face of the Earth. I stand here tonight to say that they have not been forgotten.

Mr. WEYGAND. Mr. Speaker, I come before you today to recognize the Armenian Genocide. Over a period of nine years, more than one million Armenians were systematically persecuted, expelled, and displaced from their homeland in eastern Turkey. The horrific shadows of this prejudicial, killing campaign continues to haunt us. May this day of remembrance and the stories shared here reverberate through the Nation so that history is not able to repeat itself.

Unfortunately, too few Americans know much about the suffering of the Armenian people from 1915 to 1923. During these years, the Young Turk government of the Ottoman Empire attempted to eradicate all traces of the Armenian people and their culture from Turkey. To expedite their demise, the government ordered direct killings, instituted starvation initiatives, participated in torture tactics, and forced death marches. By all accounts, this persecution was purposeful and deliberative. Such outrageous behaviors and insurmountable prosecution can only be deemed appropriately by the term "genocide", for a genocide implies complete annihilation and destruction. For political reasons, the United States government has long refused to accept this extermination and expulsion as such, fortunately that is rapidly changing.

As we remember those whose lives were lost, let us also pay tribute to those whose lives continue to thrive in spite of this dark history. The individuals that constitute the large Armenian-American population in our country continue to offer their communities valuable services and significant contributions both lo-

cally and nationally. The Armenian people continue to aggressively transform tragedy into triumph, and I salute the power of their spirit.

As we mark the anniversary of these horrific events, we need to heed the lessons learned and accept nothing less than absolute intolerance for this sort of behavior. Not only will we continue to remember and mourn the loss of so many Armenians, but we must also take notice and cease this action immediately worldwide. We must ensure that such a tragedy will never again be visited upon any people in the world.

Mr. ROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in honoring the memory of the 1.5 million martyrs of the Armenian Genocide. I want to begin by thanking the co-chairs of the Armenian Caucus, Representatives JOHN PORTER and FRANK PALLONE, for organizing this special order which pays tribute to the victims of one of history's most terrible tragedies.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of H.R. 398, the "United States Training on and Commemoration of the Armenian Genocide Resolution." This bill rightly calls upon the President of the United States to provide for appropriate training and materials to all U.S. Foreign Service officers, officials of the Department of State, and any other executive branch employee involved in responding to issues related to human rights, ethnic cleansing, and genocide by familiarizing them with the U.S. record relating to the Armenian Genocide. Further, H.R. 398 calls on the President to issue an annual message commemorating the Armenian Genocide on or about April 24, to characterize in this statement the systematic and deliberate annihilation of 1,500,000 Armenians as genocide, and also to recall the proud history of U.S. intervention in opposition to the Armenian Genocide.

Mr. Speaker, since my election to Congress in 1966, I have worked to affirm the historical record of the Armenian Genocide and have sought to respond directly to those who deny what was the first crime against humanity of the 20th century. As the eminent historian Professor Vahakn Dadrian wrote in a brief prepared on the Armenian Genocide last year for the Canadian Parliament, "When a crime of such magnitude continues to be denied, causing doubt in many well-meaning and impartial people, one must refute such denial by producing evidence that is as compelling as possible." I share this belief and for that reason I strongly support the goals laid out in H.R. 398. I look forward to working hard to secure this worthwhile bill's passage by the House International Relations Committee and further, by working to ensure that it secures broad, bipartisan support when it is considered by the full House of Representatives.

Again, I thank Representatives PORTER and PALLONE for organizing this special order and I urge all my colleagues to cosponsor H.R. 398.

Mr. McNULTY. Mr. Speaker, I join today with many of my colleagues in remembering the victims of the Armenian Genocide.

From 1915 to 1923, the world witnessed the first genocide of the 20th century. This was clearly one of the world's greatest tragedies—the deliberate and systematic Ottoman annihilation of 1.5 million Armenian men, women, and children.

Furthermore, another 500,000 refugees fled and escaped to various points around the

world—effectively eliminating the Armenian population of the Ottoman Empire.

From these ashes arose hope and promise in 1991—and I was blessed to see it. I was one of the four international observers from the United States Congress to monitor Armenia's independence referendum. I went to the communities in the northern part of Armenia, and I watched in awe as 95 percent of the people over the age of 18 went out and voted.

The Armenian people had been denied freedom for so many years and, clearly, they were very excited about this new opportunity. Almost no one stayed home. They were all out in the streets going to the polling places. I watched in amazement as people stood in line for hours to get into these small polling places and vote.

Then, after they voted, the other interesting thing was that they did not go home. They had brought covered dishes with them, and all of these polling places had little banquets afterward to celebrate what had just happened.

What a great thrill it was to join them the next day in the streets of Yerevan when they were celebrating their great victory. Ninety-eight percent of the people who voted cast their ballots in favor of independence. It was a wonderful experience to be there with them when they danced and sang and shouted, 'Ketse azat ankakh Hayastan'—long live free and independent Armenia! That should be the cry of freedom-loving people everywhere.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in solemn memorial to the estimated 1.5 million men, women, and children who lost their lives during the Armenian Genocide. As in the past, I am pleased to join so many distinguished House colleagues on both sides of the aisle in ensuring that the horrors wrought upon the Armenian people are never repeated.

On April 24, 1915, over 200 religious, political, and intellectual leaders of the Armenian community were brutally executed by the Turkish Government in Istanbul. Over the course of the next 8 years, this war of ethnic genocide against the Armenian community in the Ottoman Empire took the lives of over half the world's Armenian population.

Sadly, there are some people who still deny the very existence of this period which saw the institutionalized slaughter of the Armenian people and dismantling of Armenian culture. To those who would question these events, I point to the numerous reports contained in the United States National Archives detailing the process that systematically decimated the Armenian population of the Ottoman Empire. However, old records are too easily forgotten—and dismissed. That is why we come together every year at this time: to remember in words what some may wish to file away in archives. This genocide did take place, and these lives were taken. That memory must keep us forever vigilant in our efforts to prevent these atrocities from ever happening again.

I am proud to note that Armenian immigrants found, in the United States, a country where their culture could take root and thrive. In my district in Northwest Indiana, a vibrant Armenian-American community has developed and strong ties to Armenia continue to flourish. My predecessor in the House, the late Adam Benjamin, was of Armenian heritage, and his distinguished service in the House serves as an example to the entire Northwest Indiana

community. Over the years, members of the Armenian-American community throughout the United States have contributed millions of dollars and countless hours of their time to various Armenian causes. Of particular note are Mrs. Vicki Hovanesian and her husband, Dr. Raffi Hovanesian, residents of Indiana's First Congressional District, who have continually worked to improve the quality of life in Armenia, as well as in Northwest Indiana. Two other Armenian-American families in my congressional district, Heratch and Sonya Doumanian and Ara and Rosy Yeretsian, have also contributed greatly toward charitable works in the United States and Armenia. Their efforts, together with hundreds of other members of the Armenian-American community, have helped to finance several important projects in Armenia, including the construction of new schools, a mammography clinic, and a crucial roadway connecting Armenia to Nagorno Karabagh.

In the House, I have tried to assist the efforts of my Armenian-American constituency by continually supporting foreign aid to Armenia. This last year, with my support, Armenia received over \$100 million of the \$240 million in U.S. aid earmarked for the Southern Caucasus. I strongly oppose the Administration's efforts to increase aid to other Southern Caucasus nations at the expense of Armenia.

The Armenian people have a long and proud history. In the fourth century, they became the first nation to embrace Christianity. During World War I, the Ottoman Empire was ruled by an organization known as the Young Turk Committee, which allied with Germany. Amid fighting in the Ottoman Empire's eastern Anatolian provinces, the historic heartland of the Christian Armenians, Ottoman authorities ordered the deportation and execution of all Armenians in the region. By the end of 1923, virtually the entire Armenian population of Anatolia and western Armenia had either been killed or deported.

In order to help preserve the memory of these dark years in Armenian history, I am a proud supporter of efforts by Representatives GEORGE RADANOVICH and DAVID BONIOR to promote the use of the recorded history of these events to demonstrate to America's Foreign Service officers and State Department officials the circumstances which can push a nation along the path to genocide. Their measure, H. Res. 398, the United States Training on and Commemoration of the Armenian Genocide Resolution, would also call upon the President to characterize this policy of deportation and execution by the Ottomans as genocidal, and to recognize the American opposition and attempts at intervention during this period.

While it is important to keep the lessons of history in mind, we must also remain committed to protecting Armenia from new and more hostile aggressors. In the last decade, thousands of lives have been lost and more than a million people displaced in the struggle between Armenia and Azerbaijan over Nagorno-Karabagh. Even now, as we rise to commemorate the accomplishments of the Armenian people and mourn the tragedies they have suffered, Azerbaijan, Turkey, and other countries continue to engage in a debilitating blockade of this free nation.

Section 907 of the Freedom Support Act restricts U.S. aid for Azerbaijan as a result of this blockade. Unfortunately, as Armenia en-

ters the eleventh year of the blockade, the Administration is again asking Congress to repeal this one protection afforded the beleaguered nation. I stand in strong support of Section 907, which sends a clear message that the United States Congress stands behind the current peace process and encourages Azerbaijan to work with the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe's Minsk Group toward a meaningful and lasting resolution. In the end, I believe Section 907 will help conclude a conflict that threatens to destabilize the entire region and places the Armenian nation in distinct peril.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleagues, Representatives JOHN PORTER and FRANK PALLONE, for organizing this special order to commemorate the 58th Anniversary of the Armenian genocide. Their efforts will not only help bring needed attention to this tragic period in world history, but also serve to remind us of our duty to protect basic human rights and freedoms around the world.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 85th anniversary of the Armenian Genocide. I am a proud cosponsor of H. Res. 398 which commemorates the victims of the Armenian Genocide by calling on the President to honor the 1.5 million victims of the Armenian Genocide and to provide educational tools for our Foreign Diplomats responsible for addressing issues of human rights, ethnic cleansing, and genocide.

Throughout three decades in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, Armenians were systematically uprooted from their homeland of three thousand years, and millions were deported or massacred. From 1894 through 1896, three hundred thousand Armenians were ruthlessly murdered. Again in 1909, thirty thousand Armenians were massacred in Cilicia, and their villages were destroyed.

On April 24, 1915, two hundred Armenian religious, political, and intellectual leaders were arbitrarily arrested, taken to Turkey and murdered. This incident marks a dark and solemn period in the history of the Armenian people. From 1915 to 1923, the Ottoman Empire launched a systematic campaign to exterminate Armenians. In eight short years, more than 1.5 million Armenians suffered through atrocities such as deportation, forced slavery, and torture. Most were ultimately murdered.

The tragedy of the Armenian Genocide has been acknowledged around the world, in countries like Argentina, Belgium, Canada, Cyprus, France, Great Britain, Greece, Lebanon, Russia, the United States, and Uruguay, as well as international organizations such as the Council of Europe, the European Parliament, and the United Nations.

Yet, despite irrefutable evidence, Turkey has refused, for over 85 years, to acknowledge the Armenian Genocide. Even in present day, Turkey continues to have inimicable relations with Armenia. In addition to denying the crimes committed against the Armenian people, Turkey continues to block the flow of humanitarian aid and commerce to Armenia.

I personally admire the dedication and perseverance of the Armenian-American community, and their ever present vigil to educate the world of their painful history. In spite of their historic struggles, children and grandchildren of the survivors of the Armenian Genocide have gone on to make invaluable contributions to society, while at the same time preserving

their heritage and unique identity. Over 60,000 Armenian-Americans live in the greater Boston area. Within Massachusetts, many of these Armenians have formed public outreach groups seeking to educate society about Armenia's culture.

I made the observation last year about how sad and frustrating it was that at the beginning of this century, Armenians were murdered en masse and now, at the end of the 20th century, the same type of brutal killing of innocent people continues. The human race has now entered a new millennium, and we must be more vigilant about holding governments accountable for their actions. Last September, in East Timor, thousands of men, women, and children were mercilessly slaughtered; in Sierra Leone, thousands of children have been brutally maimed; and in Chechnya, hundreds of women and children have been forced to flee their homes, the number of deaths remain unknown. By acknowledging and commemorating the Armenian Genocide, the U.S. and many other countries are sending a message that governments cannot operate with impunity towards our fellow man.

Let me end by saying, that as a member of the Congressional Armenian Caucus, I will continue to work with my colleagues and with the Armenian-Americans in my district to promote investment and prosperity in Armenia. We must continue to be vigilant, we must preserve the rich identities of Armenians, and we must work towards ending crimes against all humanity.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join my colleagues in Congress to commemorate the 85th anniversary of the Armenian Genocide.

Between 1894 and 1923, approximately two million Armenians were massacred, persecuted, and exiled by the Turk government of the Ottoman Empire. This campaign of murder and oppression, perpetrated by the Turk government attempted to systematically wipe out the Armenian population of Anatolia, their historic homeland.

Even though the Turk government held war crime trials and condemned to death the chief perpetrators of this heinous crime against humanity, the vast majority of the culpable were set free. To this day, the Turk government denies the Armenian Genocide ever took place.

Indeed, the government of Turkey goes even further calling the Armenians "traitors" who collaborated with the enemies of the Ottoman Empire during war. We cannot permit such blatant disregard and denial to continue. Genocide is genocide, no matter how, when, or where it happens.

Mr. Speaker, there are many living survivors in my district. The memory of their tragedy still haunts them. They participate each year in commemoration ceremonies with the hope that the world will not forget their anguish. They hope that one day the Turkish government will show signs of remorse for a crime committed by their ancestors.

To me, Mr. Speaker, the Armenian Genocide is not just a footnote in history. It is something that people all over the world feel very deeply about. It is an issue above politics and partisanship. It is a question of morality.

Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that each of us works to ensure that our generation and future generations never again witness such inhuman behavior and suffering. The crime of genocide must never again be allowed to mar

the history of mankind, and today we stand with our Armenian brothers and sisters, to remember and commit ourselves to a better future in their memory.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to join with my colleagues in this solemn remembrance of the Armenian genocide. It is vitally important that we never forget the Armenian people who died in that tragedy, and all those who were persecuted in those difficult years that followed.

As we know, on April 24, 1915, Turkish officials arrested and exiled more than 200 Armenian political, intellectual and religious leaders. This symbolic cleansing of Armenian leaders began a reign of terror against the Armenian people that lasted until 1923, and resulted in the death of more than 1.5 million Armenians. Over that eight year period another 500,000 Armenians were displaced from their homes.

Mr. Speaker, many of the survivors of the Armenian genocide came to the United States, and have made countless contributions to our society. We know them well as our friends and neighbors. For years, these survivors and their descendants have told the painful story of their past, which often fell on deaf ears. I am glad to lend my voice, along with so many other of my colleagues today, to show the world how important the Armenians' story is to our history—and our future. It is amazing how often history will repeat itself, and how often we don't listen to the past. The memory of the Armenian Genocide, no matter how cruel and brutal, must serve as a lesson to us all to never ignore such actions again.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with solemn reflection to remember one of the most inhumane episodes of the 20th Century, the Armenian Genocide. From 1915 to 1922, the Ottoman Empire, ruled by Muslim Turks carried out a policy to exterminate its Christian Armenian minority. The genocide started with a series of massacres in 1894–1896, and again in 1909. This was followed by another series of massacres, which began in 1920. By 1922 the Armenians had been eradicated from their historic homeland.

There were three prevailing aspects of the Armenian Genocide: the deportations, the massacres, and the concentration camps. The deportations affected the majority of Armenians in the Turkish Empire. From as far north as the Black Sea and as far west as European Turkey, Armenians were forcibly removed and transported to the Syrian Desert. At many of these relocation sites, large-scale massacres were carried out. The few survivors were dispersed across Syria, Iraq, and as far south as Palestine.

Winston Churchill once observed that "In 1915 the Turkish Government began and ruthlessly carried out the infamous general massacre and deportation of Armenians in Asia Minor. There can be no reasonable doubt that this crime was planned and executed for political reasons."

Our former Ambassador to the Ottoman Empire (1913–16) Henry Morgenthau stated that "when the Turkish authorities gave the orders for those deportations, they were merely giving the death warrant to a whole race; they understood this well, and, in their conversations with me, they made no particular attempt to conceal this fact."

We must keep in mind the historical perspective of this terrible tragedy. Over 1.8 million Armenian civilians perished at the hands

of their Turkish persecutors. We must educate our children to tolerate each other's differences and embrace a healthy respect for humanity. Only by instilling future generations with an understanding of these terrible events in the past may we prevent them from reoccurring in the future. We must not fail to live up to our collective responsibilities; the victims of this terrible tragedy deserve nothing less.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, today, we commemorate the Armenian Genocide of April 24th 1915, and in so doing honor the memories of those who survived and those who were killed on that tragic night. It is hard to talk about that date and many would prefer not to, but if we cannot recognize the tragedies of the past, how can we avoid them in the future? Ethnic violence and genocide have marred our collective history from its earliest days, challenging generations throughout time. Yet we cannot forget these events; we cannot cover up, ignore, or rewrite history so that these crimes against humanity disappear.

Our Nation's connection to the Armenian people is great, as has been their contribution to the United States. In my home state of Rhode Island, we have one of the largest populations of Armenians in the country and the State is blessed with the gifts of the Armenian community. To truly honor those gifts, we must take time every year to understand what that community has been through, and the part of their history that is the Armenian Genocide. That is why on this day we remember the unjustifiable, unprovoked, and undeniable massacre of Armenians by the Ottoman Empire. What the Ottoman Empire began that night 85 years ago was a policy of ethnic cleansing. It can be called nothing else.

Today, brave American men and women serve in our Armed Forces across the globe. They do more than protect nations, they serve as reminders to the world and ourselves of what our country stands for. The Armenian Genocide should also serve as a reminder, of what will happen if we do nothing in the face of potential tragedies. It serves as a reminder that we must do better to protect peace and stability and human rights around the world.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the sick man of Europe had been dying a slow death. It was a particularly dark time in Europe when the sick man finally succumbed, and an empire collapsed. During World War I—a tumultuous, revolutionary time of great societal transformations and uncertain futures on the battlefields and at home—desperate Ottoman leaders fell back on the one weapon that could offer hope of personal survival. It is a weapon that is still used today, fed by fear, desperation, and hatred. It transforms the average citizen into a zealot, no longer willing to listen to reason. This weapon is, of course, nationalism. Wrongly directed, nationalism can easily result in ethnic strife and senseless genocide, committed in the name of false beliefs preached by immoral, irresponsible, reprehensible leaders.

Today I rise not to speak of the present, but in memory of the victims of the past, who suffered needlessly in the flames of vicious, destructive nationalism. On April 24, 1915, the leaders of the Ottoman government tragically chose to systematically exterminate an entire race of people. We gather in solemn remembrance of the result of that decision, remembering the loss of one-and-a-half million Armenians.

The story of the Armenian genocide is in itself appalling. It is against everything our government—and indeed all governments who strive for justice—stands for; it represents the most wicked side of humanity. What makes the Armenian story even more unfortunate is history has repeated itself in all corners of the world, and lessons that should have been learned long ago have been ignored.

We must not forget the Armenian genocide, the Holocaust, Rwanda, or Bosnia. Today, on this grim anniversary, we must remember why our armed forces fought in the skies over Yugoslavia last year.

We must not sit idly by and be spectators to the same kind of violence that killed so many Armenians; we must not watch as innocent people are brutalized not for what they have done, but simply for who they are. Ethnic cleansing is genocide and can not be ignored by a just and compassionate country. We owe it to the victims of past genocides to stamp out this form of inhumanity.

It is an honor and privilege to represent a large and active Armenian population, many who have family members who were persecuted by their Ottoman Turkish rulers. Michigan's Armenian-American community has done much to further our state's commercial, political, and intellectual growth, just as it has done in communities across the country. And so I also rise today to honor to the triumph of the Armenian people, who have endured adversity and bettered our country.

But again, Mr. Speaker, it is also my hope that in honoring the victims of the past, we learn one fundamental lesson from their experience: Never Again!

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for the opportunity to honor the memory of the one and a half million Armenians who were massacred and the over 500,000 Armenian survivors who fled into exile during the 1915–to–1923 genocide carried out by Ottoman Turkey.

As Henry Morgenthau, Sr., the U.S. Ambassador to the Ottoman Empire stated, “I am confident that the whole history of the human race contains no such horrible episode as this. The great massacres and persecutions of the past seem almost insignificant when compared to the suffering of the Armenian race in 1915.”

The new century marks the 85th Anniversary of the Armenian Genocide. I would have liked to proclaim that the United States and the international community now recognize this tragic historic event with official commemorations. I would have liked to announce that the Government of Turkey officially acknowledges the Genocide. Unfortunately, we enter the year 2000 with continuing acts of denial that this Genocide took place, efforts to re-write the historical record, and the refusal by many governments, including the United States, to use officially the word “genocide” to describe the deliberate murder of hundreds of thousands of Armenians.

Entire villages were destroyed. Entire families were exterminated. There can be no forgiveness, no peace for the dead, no comfort for the families of survivors, until Turkey and the nations of the world officially acknowledge this Genocide.

Surely as we enter the new millennium, the United States, Turkey and the international community should make this simple, but profound, statement of fact.

I'm very proud to say that Central Massachusetts, and especially the City of Worcester,

has been diligent in keeping the history of the Armenian Genocide alive and contemporary. A series of lectures to study genocide issues and present them to the general public have been organized over the past year by the Center for Holocaust Studies of Clark University, the Center for Human Rights at Worcester State College, and the Armenian National Committee of Central Massachusetts. It was my pleasure to participate in one of these forums looking at the tragedy of East Timor and its relation to past genocides.

Last month, the forum brought Dr. Israel Charny, executive director of the Institute on the Holocaust and Genocide, and professor of psychology and family therapy at Hebrew University in Israel, to speak at Worcester State College.

Dr. Charny is recognized as a leading Holocaust and genocide scholar. He is credited as one of the primary figures in the development of the field of Comparative Genocide Studies, which approaches particular genocides, including the Holocaust, as part of an ongoing history of many genocides. This field strives to understand and prevent genocide as a human rights problem and a social phenomenon that concerns all people.

In his lecture at Worcester State College, Dr. Charny spoke of his growing concern about denials of known genocides. He describes denial as “the last stage of genocide,” “political and psychological warfare,” and “a killing of the record of history.”

Charny goes on to describe some of the methods of denial. For example, there is “malevolent bigotry,” or a sloppy out and out expression of hateful denial. Another tactic is “definitionalism,” which insists on defining particular cases of mass murder as not genocide. And yet another is “human shallowness,” or a dulling of the genuine sense of tragedy and moral outrage toward such acts. Sadly, we have seen all of these, even on American college campuses, used to undermine the historical record of the Armenian Genocide.

We are blessed in Worcester to have the united efforts of Clark University, Worcester State College and the Armenian National Committee of central Massachusetts to combat such attempts to deny history.

Last Sunday, on April 9th, ANC of Central Massachusetts sponsored a lecture in Worcester by Dr. Hilmar Kaiser, who is a noted scholar on the Armenian Genocide. Dr. Hilmar also spent the weekend in Franklin, Massachusetts, at Camp Haiastan to participate in the Genocide Educational Weekend for the Armenian Youth Federation.

I am also looking forward to attending the memorial service on April 24th, organized by the Worcester Armenian churches, to commemorate the 85th Anniversary of the Armenian Genocide. That service will be held at the Church of Our Savior on Salisbury Street in Worcester.

Mr. Speaker, it is not just for our past, but for our future, that we remember and commemorate the tragedy of the Armenian Genocide—and not just annually, but every day of the year. I am proud to be a cosponsor of H. Res. 398, introduced by my colleagues Congressman RADANOVICH and Congressman BONIOR, to ensure that U.S. diplomatic personnel and other executive branch officials are well-trained in issues related to human rights, ethnic cleansing and genocide.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of H. Res. 155 to have the U.S. government share its

collection and records on the Armenian Genocide with the House International Relations Committee, the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum, and the Armenian Genocide Museum in Armenia.

We must all share the information, share the history, and keep the memory of the Armenian Genocide alive. Central Massachusetts is doing its part. I call upon my President to ensure the U.S. government does all it can to honor and officially recognize the Armenian Genocide.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today and join with my colleagues in remembering the 85th anniversary of the Armenian Genocide. I would like to thank the other members of the Congressional Caucus on Armenian Issues, and particularly the co-chairmen, Mr. PORTER and Mr. PALLONE, for their tireless efforts in organizing this fitting tribute.

Eighty-five years ago Monday, April 24, 1915, the nightmare in Armenia began. Hundreds of Armenian religious, political, and educational leaders were arrested, exiled, or murdered. These events marked the beginning of the systematic persecution of the Armenian people by the Ottoman Empire, and also launched the first genocide of the 20th century. Over the next eight years, 1.5 million Armenians were put to death and 500,000 more were exiled from their homes. These atrocities are among the most cruel and inhumane acts that have ever been recorded.

As we reflect today on the horrors that were initiated 85 years ago, I cannot help but be disturbed by those who wish to deny that these deeds occurred. Despite the overwhelming evidence to the contrary—eyewitness accounts, official archives, photographic evidence, diplomatic reports, and testimony of survivors—they reject the claim that genocide, or any other crime for that matter, was perpetrated against Armenians. Well, History tells a different story.

Let me read a quote from Henry Morgenthau, Sr., U.S. Ambassador to the Ottoman Empire at the time: “When the Turkish authorities gave the orders for these deportations, they were merely giving the death warrant to a whole race; they understood this well, and, in their conversations with me, they made no particular attempt to conceal the fact. . . .”

The world knows the truth about this tragic episode in human affairs. We will not allow those who wish to rewrite History to absolve themselves from responsibility for their actions. This evening's event here in the House of Representatives is testament to that fact. We can only hope that the recognition and condemnation of this, and other instances of genocide, will prevent a similar instance from happening again in the 21st Century.

In addition, I also encourage my colleagues to join me and the 37 other members who have cosponsored H. Res. 398, offered by Representative RADANOVICH. This resolution will help affirm the record of the United States on the Armenian Genocide and will play a role in educating others about the atrocities that were committed against the Armenian people. It is critical that we continue to acknowledge this terrible tragedy to ensure that it is neither forgotten nor ignored.

I would like to once again thank the organizers of this event and I would like to once again reaffirm my sincere thanks for being given the opportunity to participate in this solemn remembrance.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in commemorating the 85th anniversary of the Armenian Genocide.

On April 24, 1915, the Ottoman government unleashed an eight-year assault against its Armenian population. During this brutal campaign, one and a half million innocent men, women, and children were murdered, Armenian communities were systematically destroyed, and over one million people were forcibly deported.

The pain of these atrocities is only compounded by the Turkish government's revisionism and denial of the tragic events that took place. This is what Elie Wiesel has called a "double killing"—murdering the dignity of the survivors and the remembrance of the crime. It is incumbent upon us to stand up against these efforts and make United States records documenting this period available to students, historians, and the descendants of those who survived.

This somber anniversary is a tribute to the memory of the victims of the Armenian Genocide, and a painful reminder that the world's inaction left a tragic precedent for other acts of senseless bloodshed. The road from Armenia to Auschwitz is direct. If more attention had been centered on the slaughter of these innocent men, women, and children, perhaps the events of the Holocaust might never have taken place.

Today, we vow once more that genocide will not go unnoticed and unmourned. We pledge to stand up against governments that persecute their own people, and declare our commitment to fight all crimes against humanity and the efforts to hide them from the rest of the world.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. Speaker, today I join with my colleagues in what has become an annual event in which none of us take great joy in. Today, the Turkish government still denies the Armenian genocide and it does so to its own detriment. All of us would like to see the denial in Ankara end. The Armenian genocide happened. The historic fact, Mr. Speaker, is that 1.5 million Armenians were killed and over 500,000 deported from 1894 to 1921.

On April 24, 1915, 300 Armenian leaders, writers and intellectuals were rounded up, deported and killed. 5000 other poor Armenians were killed in their homes. The Turkish government continues to deny the Armenian genocide and claims that Armenians were only removed from the eastern war zone. America has been enriched in countless ways from the survivors of the Armenian genocide who have come here. As a representative from Michigan, I want to especially highlight that we have been blessed by the contributions of the Armenian communities.

Today I rise to call upon the Republic of Turkey, an ally of the United States, to admit what happened. Mr. Speaker, we want Turkey to see its history for what it is so it can see its future for what it can be. Let us all rise today to commemorate the Armenian genocide and hope that events like it never happen again.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with my colleagues to acknowledge the horrific events that occurred during the Armenian Genocide from 1915 to 1923, the final days of the Ottoman Empire.

The horror of the Genocide is seared in the minds of Armenians around the world. Beginning in 1915 the Ottoman Empire, ruled by

Muslim Turks, carried out a series of massacres in order to eliminate its Christian Armenian minority. By 1923, 1.5 million Armenians were brutally killed, while another 500,000 were deported. Stateless and penniless. Armenians were forced to move to any country that afforded refuge. Many found their way to the United States, while others escaped to countries such as Russia and France.

Future generations must be made aware of this historic event in our world history. It is unfortunate that the Republic of Turkey refuses to acknowledge the genocide against the Armenians. Innocent people were deprived of their freedom and senselessly killed because of their religious or political beliefs.

Armenia has made great strides to become an independent state. In 1992 the newly independent republic of Armenia, became a member of the United Nations, and in 1995 held their first open legislative elections.

Since the genocide, various acts of human rights violations have continued to take place around the world. If we ever hope to prevent further genocides we must never forget the atrocities endured by the Armenian people.

ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, today I come to the floor to commemorate the anniversary of one of the darkest stains on the history of Western Civilization—the genocide of the Armenian people by the Ottoman Turkish Empire. I greatly appreciate the strong support of so many of our colleagues in this effort, especially the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. PALLONE, my fellow co-chairman of the Armenian Issues Caucus.

I wish, as every Member does, that this Special Order did not have to take place. But every year, I return to the floor in April to speak out about the past. To fail to remember the past, not only dishonors the victims and survivors—it encourages future tyrants to believe that they can commit such heinous acts with impunity. Unfortunately, we have seen over and over the tragic results of hatred and ignorance: the Holocaust, the Rwandan Genocide, the ethnic cleansing in the former Yugoslavia, the continued mass killing in the Sudan and the massacres in East Timor last fall. And far too often the so-called civilized nations of the world turned a blind eye.

On April 24, 1915, over 200 Armenian religious, political and intellectual leaders were arrested in Istanbul and killed, marking the beginning of an 8-year campaign which resulted in the destruction of the ethnic Armenian community which had previously lived in Anatolia and Western Armenia. Between 1915 and 1923, approximately 1.5 million men, women and children were deported, forced into slave labor camps, tortured and eventually exterminated.

The Armenian Genocide was the first genocide of the modern age and has been recognized as a precursor of subsequent attempts to destroy a race through an official systematic effort. Congress has consistently demanded recognition of the historical fact of the Armenian Genocide. The modern German Government, although not itself responsible for the horrors of the Holocaust, has taken responsi-

bility for and apologized for it. Yet, the Turkish Government continues to deny that the Armenian genocide ever took place.

The past year has seen small steps of progress concerning Turkey's relationship with its neighbors. The devastating earthquakes of last summer in Turkey and subsequently Greece, allowed various nations in the region, including Armenia, to work together on humanitarian grounds. Turkey's EU candidacy is forcing it to face its problems both with its neighbors Greece, and Cyprus as well as internal problems such as its continuing human rights violations.

Although I am encouraged by these small steps, Turkey has yet to show the world that it is serious about solving the human rights problems within its borders. Remaining in jail are the Kurdish parliamentarians who were arrested over six years ago as well as numerous human rights workers. At the end of 1999, Turkey had the second highest number of journalists in jail—eighteen—the only country in the world with more was China. I sincerely hope Turkey's desire to become part of the EU community will require Turkey to improve its internal human rights problems as well as face its past and acknowledge its role in one of the 20th centuries greatest tragedies—the Armenian Genocide.

Armenians will remain vigilant to ensure that this tragic history is not repeated. The United States should do all that it can in this regard as well, including a clear message about the historical fact of the Armenian Genocide. We do Turkey no favors by enabling her self-delusion, and we make ourselves hypocrites when we fail to sound the alarm on what is happening today in Turkey.

Armenia has made amazing progress in rebuilding a society and a nation—a triumph of the human spirit in the face of dramatic obstacles. Armenia is committed to democracy, market economics and the rule of law. Even in the face of the tragedy which befell the Armenian Government last October, where eight people were murdered in the parliament including the Prime Minister Sarkisian, the Armenian Government and its people remain committed to freedom and democracy. I will continue to take a strong stand in Congress in support of these principles and respect for human rights, and I am proud to stand with Armenia in so doing. We must never forget what happened to the Armenians 85 years ago, just as we must never overlook the human rights violations which are happening today in all corners of the world.

1730

IN REMEMBRANCE OF THE ARMENIAN HOLOCAUST

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOSSELLA). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to commemorate one of the most tragic events in the 20th century and that is, of course, the Armenian Genocide of 1915 to 1923. It ranks amongst the most tragic episodes. It was the first but unfortunately not the last of the incidents of ethnic genocide that the world experienced during the last

century. More than one and a half million innocent Armenians had their lives ended mercilessly.

It is staggering to even contemplate the idea of one and a half million people having their lives ended so arbitrarily, but we must remember the victims of this genocide as they were, not numbers but mothers and fathers and sons and daughters, brothers, sisters, aunts, uncles, cousins and, of course, friends. Each and every victim had hopes, dreams, and a life that deserved to be lived to the fullest.

It is our duty to remember them today and every day. As we stand here today at the beginning of a new century and a new millennium, we should take a moment to speak about the need that that tragic event serves as a constant reminder for us to be on guard against the repression of any people, particularly any oppression based on their race or their religion.

Unfortunately, during the genocide, the world turned a blind eye to the horrors that were inflicted. Too often during the last century the world stood silent while whole races and religions were attacked and nearly annihilated. As the saying goes, those who forget history are doomed to repeat it. We must never forget the important lessons of the Armenian Genocide.

As a member, Mr. Speaker, of the Congressional Armenian Caucus, I join many others in the House of Representatives working hopefully to bring peace and stability to Armenia and its neighboring countries. Division and hatred can only lead to more division and hatred, as has too often been proved. Hopefully the work of the caucus and of others committed to the same cause will help ensure that an atrocity such as the genocide will never happen again in Armenia or elsewhere.

While I might not be Armenian, Mr. Speaker, my wife is and many, many of our friends, which causes me, of course, to say "yes odar empaytz seerdus high e."

I am not Armenian but my heart is, and we all should have our heart with them on this particular occasion.

WE MUST REMEMBER THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE SO THAT IT NEVER HAPPENS AGAIN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, like many of my colleagues, I rise to remember the Armenian Genocide which took place over several years, but the remembrance day is to remember an event 85 years ago, so this is a particularly important anniversary of that genocide.

We are asked why it is so important to come to this floor again and again to remember. We must remember so that it never happens again, and we must remember because there is an organized effort to hide and to disclaim

this genocide; and we must overcome that effort, and we must never forget.

Let us look at the historical record. The American ambassador to the Ottoman Empire in 1919 was an eyewitness. In his memoirs, he said, "When the Turkish authorities gave the order for these deportations they were merely giving the death warrant to an entire race. They understood this well and in their conversations with me made no particular attempt to conceal this fact."

He went on to describe what he saw at the Euphrates River, and he said, as our eyes and ears in the Ottoman Empire, because that is the role an ambassador plays, in the year 1919, "I have by no means told the most terrible details, for a complete narration of the sadistic orgies of which they, the Armenian men and women, are victims can never be printed in an American publication. Whatever crimes the most perverted instincts of the human mind can devise, whatever refinements of persecution and injustice the most debased imagination can conceive, became the daily misfortune of the Armenian people."

As other speakers have pointed out, this was the first genocide of the 20th century, and it laid the foundation for the Holocaust to follow.

We can never forget that 8 days before he invaded Poland, Adolf Hitler turned to his inner circle and said, "Who today remembers the extermination of the Armenians?" The impunity with which the Turkish government acted in annihilating the Armenian people emboldened Adolf Hitler and his inner circle to carry out the Holocaust of the Jewish people. Unfortunately, today there is an organized effort to expunge from the memory of the human race this genocide, and it focuses on our academic institutions.

Mr. Speaker, I am a proud graduate of UCLA; and a few years ago UCLA was offered a million dollars to create a special chair that would be under the partial control of the Turkish government, a chair in history that would have been used to cover up and to disclaim and to deny the first genocide of the 20th century.

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud of UCLA for many things. I was there when Bill Walton led us to the NCAA championship, but I was never prouder of my alma mater than when UCLA said no to a million dollars; and it is important that every American academic institution say no to genocide denial.

It is also important that the State Department go beyond shallow, hollow reminders and remembrances of this day and step forward and use the word genocide in describing the genocide of the Armenian people at the hands of the Turks.

It is time for Turkey to acknowledge this genocide, because only in that way can they rise above it. The German government has been quite forthcoming in acknowledging the Holo-

caust, and in doing so it has at least been respected by the peoples of the world for its honesty. Turkey should follow that example rather than trying to buy chairs at American universities to deny history.

Mr. Speaker, we must go beyond merely remembering the Armenian Genocide and also insist that the survivors of that genocide are treated justly, that the people of Armenia and Artsakh enjoy freedom and independence; and we must end the blockade of Armenia imposed by Turkey.

Mr. Speaker, when it comes to this genocide, we must say, and say loudly, never again and never forget.

WHAT DO WE WANT CHINA TO BE 20 YEARS FROM NOW OR EVEN 50 YEARS FROM NOW?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, remembering the genocide of the Armenians, but I would like to add this: that there are Armenian children dying today in Armenia. While other nations brutalize Armenia, the White House and State Department cut funds for Armenia. They are not the only White House and State Department to do so, but there is enough of us, instead of making just a resolution, to make a binding resolution for the White House to do something about it.

Also, I should speak to another event I had not planned on speaking to tonight, but I actually resent some of the statements made earlier tonight. My wife and daughters attend Catholic mass at Saint James Parish, and the speaker of this House took the well and shamed those Democrats that would use religion for political gain. I heard this again tonight. I ask the minority leader to ask to put an end to their side of using religion for politics. It does not belong in this Chamber. I have attended events at synagogues, at parishes and churches, but what I would not attend is a fund-raiser at a Buddhist temple.

The real reason I came tonight, Mr. Speaker, was to talk about PNTR for China. I would like to present some thoughts. China is a rogue nation. The issue generates strong-held opinions on both sides and both Republicans and Democrats are split on this particular issue. Even myself, I personally struggled, knowing what a rogue nation that China is, the human rights violations, the national security threats, and what does it mean applying PNTR to China.

Communication is the shortest distance between two points of view, and I know that my mother, my children and many Americans, if they never hear some of the positive points, they are most likely not going to support trade with China.

I would like to present a couple of those ideas. I recently traveled to Vietnam with the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) and some of my Democrat colleagues. We were there at the request of Pete Peterson, a fellow member that used to reside in this House, is now the ambassador to Vietnam. I was asked to help raise the flag over North Vietnam for the first time in 25 years. It was very difficult; but while we were there, we stopped in Hanoi, and we had a chat with the Communist minister, the head of Vietnam.

I asked a question. I said, Mr. Minister, why will you not engage in trade with Vietnam? And his answer was pretty forthcoming. He said, Congressman, trade to a Communist means that people will start privatizing and having their own things; and if trade is followed through in Vietnam, then we as Communists will no longer have power.

At that moment I said, trade is good.

What do we want China to be 20 years from now or even 50 years from now, Mr. Speaker? I was in China some 20 years ago, and I want to say they have come a long way in 20 years, and it is not the same China as it was before. One sees democracy sprouting up. One sees things like Tianenmen Square and people fighting for democracy. Democracy and freedom are viruses to the Communist Chinese. The more that we can inject that into China, the more that their leaders go along with a better economy.

China is riding a tiger. There are still those that want, by totalitarian rule, to control with national defense and hold people under the state command; but also the dictatorship there today understands that the economy is important to China. Taiwan supports trade in PNTR. Why? Taiwan knows that it will bring China more toward the United States and more toward a democracy instead of more toward Communism. It is in their best interest, and Taiwan supports it.

We just attended a brief, many of us, by Brent Scowcroft. He said there are no downsides to PNTR; that this is about U.S. products going to China. China's products already come to the United States, and there is a trade deficit.

What do we want 20 years from now if we do not trade with China? It will be a negative, and we foster Communism instead of a good economy for both.

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the special order time of the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, as a proud member of the Congressional Caucus on Armenian Issues and the representative of a large and vibrant community of Armenian Americans, some of whom lost their loved ones in the genocide, I rise today to join my colleagues in the sad commemoration of the Armenian Genocide.

I would like to thank my colleagues and cochair of the Armenian Caucus, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER), for their dedication and their hard work on this issue and other issues of human rights.

Today, we pause to remember the tragedy of the Armenian Genocide. More than 1.5 million Armenians were systematically murdered at the hands of the young Turks and more than 500,000 more were deported from their homes. Monday, April 24, will mark the 85th anniversary of the beginning of the Armenian genocide. It was on that day in 1915 that more than 200 Armenian religious, political, and intellectual leaders were arrested in Constantinople, now Istanbul, and killed. This was the beginning of a brutal, organized campaign to eliminate the Armenian presence from the Ottoman Empire that lasted for more than 8 years, but Armenians are strong people, and their dreams of freedom did not die.

More than 70 years after the genocide, the new Republic of Armenia was born as the Soviet Union crumbled. Today, we pay tribute to the courage and strength of a people who would not know defeat; yet independence has not meant an end to their struggle. There are still those who question the reality of the Armenian slaughter. There are those who have failed to recognize its very existence; and my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) spoke earlier about efforts at UCLA to buy a chair that would really focus its time and attention to erasing the existence of this horrible occurrence.

1745

I join him in applauding UCLA and other institutions that have turned down this request to put forward a lie.

As a strong supporter of human rights, I am dismayed that the Turkish government continues to deny the systemic killing of 1.5 million Armenians in their country.

We must not allow the horror of the Armenian genocide to be either diminished or denied, and we must continue to speak out and preserve the memory of the Armenian loss.

We can never let the truth of this tragedy be denied. Nothing we can do or say will bring back those who perished. But we can hold high the memories with everlasting meaning by

teaching the lessons of the Armenian genocide to future generations. We will not forget. We will continue to bring this to the floor every single year. We will not forget.

ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOSSELLA). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the leaders of the Armenian Caucus for bringing us together to honor the memory of a tragedy, not just in Armenian history, but a tragedy in world history, a tragedy that holds for us an important historical lesson and one that should be acknowledged.

As discussed, it was 85 years ago that the Ottoman Empire set out on a deliberate campaign to exterminate the Armenian people. Over a period of years, between 1915 and 1923, as they went house to house, village to village, they massacred men, women, and children, a total of 1.5 million, and a half million deported from their homelands to escape their terror.

At the end of these 8 years, the Armenian population in certain areas in Turkey, in Anatolia, in Western Armenia, that population was virtually eliminated.

At the time, as we have heard from our colleagues, Henry Morgenthau, the U.S. ambassador to the Ottoman Empire, depicted the Turkish order for deportations as a death warrant to a whole race.

Our ambassador recognized that this was ethnic cleansing. It is unfortunate that the Turkish government to this day does not recognize that this was ethnic cleansing. Let me just say that willful ignorance of the lessons of history doom people to repeat those same actions again and again.

We have also heard from our colleagues tonight how Adolph Hitler learned that same lesson, as he said, who remembers the Armenian genocide? Well, it is important for us to remember these genocides. It is important that we learn the lesson from this 85-year-old tragedy.

In my home State of California, the State Board of Education has incorporated the story of the Armenian genocide in the social studies curriculum, and this is the right thing to do.

I am a cosponsor of House Resolution 398, which calls upon the President of the United States to provide for appropriate training and materials on the Armenian genocide to all foreign service officers and all State Department officials.

Why is this important? Because we want them to better understand genocide wherever it threatens to erupt. We want them to understand the nature and origins of genocide. We want them to help raise the world's public opinion

against genocide, wherever it starts to foment.

By recognizing and learning about the crime against humanity, specifically about the Armenian genocide, we can begin to honor the courage of its victims and commemorate the strides made by its survivors and hope that others will not have to go down the track following the experiences that were suffered by the people of Armenia, only to be followed by the Jewish genocide and other genocides that we have seen, such as the one going on in Southern Sudan today.

So, again, let me commemorate and let me thank the Armenian Caucus for bringing this issue to us on this anniversary of that genocide.

COMMEMORATION OF THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues today to remember one of the worst atrocities of the twentieth century—the Armenian Genocide. April 24 will be the eighty-fifth anniversary of the beginning of the Armenian Genocide. Since that date falls during the April recess and the House will be out of session, I have chosen to make my remarks today.

From 1915 to 1923, one-and-a-half million Armenians died and countless others suffered as a result of the systematic and deliberate campaign of genocide by the rulers of the Ottoman Turkish Empire. Half a million Armenians who escaped death were deported from their homelands, in modern-day Turkey, to the harsh deserts of the Middle East.

We cannot let succeeding generations forget these horrible atrocities, nor deny that they ever happened. Therefore it is important for the U.S. Government to recognize the Armenian Genocide and do what it can to ensure that the genocide's historical records are preserved, just as the artifacts of the Nazi Holocaust are preserved. By keeping memories alive through preserving history, we and our children can learn about the chilling consequences of mass hatred, bigotry and intolerance. And hopefully, by teaching and reminding ourselves of past atrocities, humanity will not be doomed to repeat them.

The Armenian-American communities throughout the United States, as well as all people of goodwill, stand firm in our resolve not to let the world forget the Armenian Genocide. In solidarity with the victims of the Jewish Holocaust, the Cambodian massacres, the Tutsi Genocide in Rwanda, and ethnic cleansing in the Balkans, we must continually recognize these crimes against humanity and steadfastly oppose the use of genocide anywhere in the world.

In closing, I hope that every American will stand in solidarity with our Armenian sisters and brothers to commemorate the eighty-fifth anniversary of the Armenian Genocide. Let us honor all victims of torture and genocide by paying tribute to their memory, showing them compassion, and never forgetting the suffering they have endured.

REMEMBERING THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. ESHOO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening with all of my colleagues that have come to the floor, members of the Armenian Caucus here in the House of Representatives, on the occasion of the anniversary of the 1915 Armenian genocide to remember the 1½ million human beings, the women, the children, the men who were killed, and the 500,000 Armenians forcibly deported by the Ottoman Empire during an 8-year reign of brutal repression.

Armenians were deprived of their homes, their humanity, and ultimately their lives. Yet, America, as the greatest democracy and the land of freedom, has not yet made an official statement regarding the Armenian genocide.

Today, there are some in Congress, some in our country that ignore the lessons of the past by refusing to comment on the events surrounding the genocide. They are encouraging new hardships for Armenia by moving to lift sanctions against Azerbaijan caused by their continuing blockade of Armenia.

I am very proud, Mr. Speaker, of my heritage. I am part Armenian and part Assyrian. I believe the only Member of Congress both in the House and the Senate to claim these heritages. I came to this understanding, not just when I arrived in the Congress, as so many of us at the knees of our grandparents and the elders in our family, we were told firsthand the stories of the hardship and the suffering.

That is how I come to this understanding and this knowledge and why I bring this story and this understanding to the floor of the House and, indeed, to the House of Representatives.

I am very proud of this heritage and the contributions which my people have made to this great Nation. They have distinguished themselves in the arts, in law, in academics, in every walk of life in our great Nation, and they keep making important contributions to the life of this Nation.

It is inconceivable to me that this Nation would choose in some quarters to keep its head in the sand by not stating in the strongest terms our recognition of the genocide and our objection to what took place.

Why do I say this? Because I think it is very important to express very publicly, not only acknowledge what happened, but also understand that when we acknowledge that we are then teaching present and future generations of the events of yesteryear. As we move to educate today's generation about these lessons, we also express to them what we have learned.

To deny that a genocide occurred places a black mark on the values that our great Nation stands and fights for. I am proud to be a cosponsor, of course, of responsible legislation that brings

the tragedies in Armenia's history out of the shadows and into the light.

House Resolution 155, the U.S. Record on the Armenian Genocide Resolution, directs the President to provide a complete collection of all United States records related to the Armenian genocide to document and affirm the United States record of protest in recognition of this crime against humanity.

House Resolution 398, the U.S. Training on and Commemoration of the Armenian Genocide Resolution would affirm the U.S. record on the genocide and would very importantly educate others about the atrocities committed and the lessons we can learn from this tragedy against the people of Armenia. These are but two important steps we in the Congress can immediately take today.

I urge my colleagues to support these efforts to pass these bills.

In closing, I want to pay tribute to all of my colleagues that come to the floor every year on this. For those of my colleagues that are tuned into C-SPAN, Republicans, Democrats of all backgrounds from different States, communities across our Nation who recognize what took place, and come to the floor in humble tribute to those that gave their lives.

But it is up to us that really are entrusted with the life and the well-being of our Nation. Yes, to acknowledge and to pay tribute and to say how important this is. But as we do, understand that we do it for the enlightenment of our young people and to remind ourselves that wherever anything like this raises its head around the globe that we, as Members of the United States Congress, and as citizens of this great Nation, that we will give voice to that.

So I pay tribute to all of my colleagues. Those people who are resting in peace, perhaps where they are looking from are smiling and saying thank you to Members of the Congress for recognizing this. It is a sad time, but the recognition is well deserved.

PROJECT EXILE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to speak about a piece of legislation passed on the floor of this House yesterday, Project Exile. Project Exile will send \$100 million to qualifying States who require a minimum 5-year sentence for criminals who use guns. This will send a clear message to criminals that, if they use a gun, they will go to jail, and they will go to jail for 5 years.

Project Exile will reverse the current situation and put criminals behind the bars of justice rather than law-abiding citizens of America being behind bars on the windows of their own homes.

Today, the average gun felon is locked up for about 18 months then

they are free to ravage our neighborhoods and our communities, our children's playgrounds, and our schools. I say, if they are going to do the crime, they need to do the time.

Project Exile finally focuses prosecution on criminals rather than laying the blame on firearms. Laws on guns only affect law-abiding citizens. Criminals, by their very nature, do not obey laws. We need common sense enforcement of existing law.

For decades, the anti-second amendment lobby has attacked gun manufacturers and law-abiding citizens, demanding laws and restrictions that further impede the inalienable rights of Americans to protect themselves, their loved ones, and their property. The anti-second amendment lobby has used a series of lies and half truths to spew a message and strike fear in the hearts of America.

David Kopel recently wrote an excellent piece in the April 17 issue of the *National Review*. He listed many of the prominent lies of the anti-gun crowd.

I believe it is critical in any debate that we discuss the merits of any issue based on fact, not on myth. Today I want to correct some of the misinformation that is out there so that we can base our decisions on fact alone.

The first myth is that, up to 17 children are killed every day in gun violence. I agree that even one child killed by a gun is one too many. Parents who choose to have guns in their home need to be cautious, conscientious, and aware of the gun, where it is, and absolutely certain that no child has access to it.

However, this statistic that 17 children die of gun violence every day is not exactly a fact. For that to be true, one has to include 18- and 19-year-olds as well as even some young adults. Nearly all of the deaths that are counted in this statistic are members of gangs, those in the act of committing a crime, or, unfortunately, those committing suicide. The actual gun death rate for children under the age of 14 is less than the rate of children who drown in swimming pool accidents.

The second lie is the so-called gun-show loophole. If any individual is engaged in the business of selling firearms, no matter where the sale takes place, whether it be in a store, his home, or a gun show, the seller must file a government registration form on every buyer and clear the sale through the FBI's National Instant Check System.

1800

To hear the President and Vice President say it, and other anti-second amendment people, one would think that 98 percent of crimes occur with guns that were bought at gun shows. In reality, according to the 1997 National Institute of Justice study, only 2 percent of guns used in crimes were purchased at gun shows.

The third lie is that the average citizen is committing many of these gun

crimes out there and that Americans are too ill tempered to be trusted with guns. But as my colleagues might guess, the facts tell a different picture. Seventy-five percent of murderers have adult criminal records. And a large portion of the other 25 percent have arrests and convictions as juveniles that are sealed under the cloak of youth offender protections, or they are actually teenagers when they kill.

Another interesting note is that 90 percent of adult murderers have adult criminal records. Why do we pretend, when we discover that criminals commit crimes, why do we pretend to be shocked? Over 99 percent of the gun owners in America responsibly use the guns that they have for hunting or protection. Why does the liberal anti-second amendment crowd want to continue placing burden upon burden on the 99 percent of gun owners who are law-abiding citizens?

With the passage of Project Exile: The Safe Streets and Neighborhoods Act, we are trying to protect law-abiding citizens from these hardened gun-shooting criminals, criminals who have no respect for life nor for any other individual. Americans for too long have been held hostage by the thugs and drug dealers, the robbers and the gang members, and the lawless and the outlaw. We must reclaim our streets and reclaim our communities and reclaim our American heritage. We need to move forward with other important legislation like this.

WORKER COMPENSATION FOR NATIONAL LABORATORY EMPLOYEES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOSSELLA). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the issue of worker compensation. Today, the administration, Secretary Richardson, President Clinton, and Vice President GORE announced a worker compensation program for workers at the national laboratories all across this country.

This has been a very sad chapter in the history of the United States. Workers have worked at these nuclear establishments and plants for many years, and they have been injured as a result, many of them have been injured, the Department now acknowledges, as a result of occupational exposures. The Department has decided to turn over a new leaf, and I applaud their position on that; and I rise today to put a piece of legislation in the hopper to deal with this situation.

In New Mexico, about 3 weeks ago, I attended a hearing in my district where workers came forward. They talked about how patriotic they were; they talked about how they were serving their country for many, many years and, as a result of their work,

they believed they came down with cancers, with beryllium disease, with asbestosis, with a variety of other illnesses. They were very heart-wrenching stories.

Today, I introduce a piece of legislation that will be comprehensive legislation. It will deal with all of these injuries that occurred and that were talked about at Los Alamos. It is comprehensive in the sense that it will cover beryllium, it will cover radiation, it will cover asbestos, and it will cover chemicals that these workers were exposed to.

The legislation provides that the workers will be able to come forward, very similar to the Workmen's Compensation program that is in place for the Federal Government. They will be able to demonstrate their exposure and what the illness was.

My legislation will also provide that during the 180-day period, while their claim is pending, that they will be able to get health care for free at the nearest Veterans Hospital.

And the burden is on the Government, because many of these individuals came forward and talked about how they had worked their whole life, and they knew there were exposures; but then, at the end of their period of time, they asked for their records and there were no records. Their records were lost. So under those circumstances, we clearly have to put the burden on the Government.

So I would urge my colleagues today, while my bill is specifically directed to New Mexico, I know there are many other colleagues around the country that have this same situation in their district. There are Democrats and Republicans. All areas of the United States are represented. So I think this is a great issue for us to join together in a bipartisan way and craft a solution to this problem at the national level.

The reason I think it is so important is that these workers were true patriots. They were people that loved their country and cared about their country and worked for it at a very crucial time for us, so we need now to do something for them.

COMMEMORATION OF THE LIFE OF HERMAN B. WELLS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. WILSON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PEASE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PEASE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the life of Herman B. Wells, the 12th president of Indiana University, and the only person to serve that institution on three different occasions as its chief executive officer.

In 1937, he was appointed acting president. From 1938 to 1962, he was president; in 1968 he was interim president; and from 1968 to 2000 he served as chancellor. He died in Bloomington on March 18 and was buried the next week

in Jamestown, Indiana, his ancestral home.

Part of Monroe County, where Indiana University is located, and all of Boone County, where Chancellor Wells was laid to rest, are in my district, the seventh, of Indiana. As the representative of that district in Congress, it is my privilege, indeed my honor, to mark with pride the life and contributions of this amazing son of Indiana. As one whose personal life was also touched by this wonderful man, I am humbled by the realization that it was in part his influence on my life that made it possible for me to be here in the well of the House to share these thoughts.

Though he would undoubtedly object to the personal characterization, observing the work of so many others, Herman B. Wells transformed Indiana University from a modest Midwestern State institution of 11,000 students to a world-class institution of research, service, and teaching with more than 30,000 students in Bloomington, the main campus, and more than 80,000 students on eight campuses across the State. His insistence on academic excellence from faculty and from students, and his willingness to actively support the excellence he encouraged, resulted in the development of one of the world's finest schools of music, the attraction of eminent scholars, including Nobel laureates, the development of one of the finest collections of rare books in the world, and much more. He was a fierce defender of academic freedom, as witnessed among other things by his steadfast support of the Kinsey Institute, at its time one of the most controversial research centers in the Nation.

He has served on more national and international cultural, educational, and development commissions and agencies and been honored by more national governments, nongovernmental organizations, and international entities than I can list in the time allotted me today. Suffice it to say that he was a man of incredible vision, equally incredible talent, and a commitment to humanity that transcended race, gender, religion, and national borders.

Yet he never lost the personal touch, grounded in his intense interest in each human being he met as simply a person and, thereby, imbued with an innate dignity that warranted treatment with respect. And that is, in the final analysis, what made this man a giant in American education and culture.

Chancellor Wells once listed what he calls his "Maxims for a Young College President, or How to Succeed Without Really Trying." His autobiography, "Being Lucky," derived its title from the list, where he said, "My first maxim is, be lucky."

Perhaps he was, though I suspect that he made more of his luck than just happened to come his way. I know this, though, that those of us who attended his Indiana University, and especially those of us who, like me, came

to know him personally, were most assuredly lucky; and our lives have been enriched in ways we could never before have imagined as a consequence of our contact with him.

From the nationally and internationally recognized faculty in whose classes I studied, to the fraternity system based on the finest traditions of ethical behavior that he fostered and from which I benefited, to an enduring idealism and assuredness in the future that imbued the IU campus, even in the midst of the difficulties of the late 1960s and early 1970s, my life has been shaped in many ways by my experiences at Indiana University. And everyone who experienced Indiana University was touched by Herman Wells.

Chancellor Wells often said that it is not what you do that counts; it is what you help others to do that makes progress. I know no finer example of this maxim than the chancellor himself. Indiana has lost one of its greatest sons. I have lost a mentor and friend. And yet our grief at this inestimable loss is assuaged by the realization that the university he helped build endures as one of the world's great institutions, stamped with his principles and personality. And for those of us who knew him personally, there is the memory of the sparkle in the eye, the engagement of the intellect, and the smile in the heart that was and remains Herman B. Wells.

With apologies to the lyrics of our alma mater for this temporary emendation, "He's the pride of Indiana." We loved him, we will miss him, we are better because of him.

COMMEMORATING THE LIFE OF LANCE CORPORAL SETH G. JONES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Madam Speaker, I rise today with profound sadness to honor the short, yet exceptional life of Lance Corporal Seth G. Jones, who perished last Saturday, along with 18 fellow Marines, in an aircraft crash near Marana, Arizona.

Madam Speaker, Lance Corporal Jones was only 18 years of age. A native of Bend, Oregon, and a graduate of Mountain View High School, he joined the Marine Corps in February of 1999. After graduating from the Marine Corps Recruit Depot in San Diego, California, Seth fulfilled his long-held dream of serving in the infantry. At the time of his death, he served as an assaultman assigned to the 3rd Battalion, 5th Marines, stationed at Camp Pendleton, California.

Remembered by friends and family alike as a motivated young American with a steadfast sense of patriotism and duty, Lance Corporal Jones was, quite simply, what parents want their children to grow up to be. His high school ROTC instructor remembered him as "more than enthusiastic, ener-

getic and intense. Seth was turbocharged." Seth's hockey coach recalled meeting him after he completed basic training and saying, "In that short time he had gone from a teenager to an adult. He had grown up."

Madam Speaker, nothing is more tragic than a life so full of promise cut short before its time. And there is no worse grief than that suffered by parents who must bury their child, because it is not the way life's journey is supposed to go.

Lance Corporal Jones answered his country's call and he knew the meaning of the word duty. While he did not die in a hail of gunfire, Seth gave his life for his country nonetheless. Training for the day when he might be called upon to defend his native land, he gladly shouldered a responsibility few of us can fully appreciate. In an age when most kids are worried about what they are going to wear on Saturday night, Seth was jumping out of helicopters and practicing hostage rescue.

Madam Speaker, surrounded by the luxury of our system of government that is afforded us, we often forget that there are still people among us whose job it is to carry rifles into battle, who shoot at our enemies and are in turn shot at, so that we may continue to live as a free people. There are men like Lance Corporal Jones who are familiar with the chill of a night spent in a foxhole and the exhaustion of a forced march who protect those of us who are not.

John Stuart Mill once wrote, "A man who has nothing he cares about more deeply than his personal safety is a miserable creature who has no chance of being free, unless made and kept so by the exertions of better men than himself." Lance Corporal Jones, and the Marines who lost their lives, were the very guardians of our liberty, Madam Speaker, the men whose exertions keep us free. To his family, to his country, and to his Corps, Lance Corporal Jones, like his fellow fallen Marines, was as the Marine Corps motto reads: Always faithful.

While the cause of this tragic accident is still unknown, this morning I met with Lieutenant General Fred McCorkle, deputy chief of staff for the Marine Corps Aviation, to underscore the need for a full investigation to be undertaken to ensure that the equipment used by our men and women in uniform does not subject them to unnecessary risks.

1815

In this time of grief, my deepest sympathy goes out to the family of Lance Corporal Jones as it does to the entire Marine Corps family.

COMMEMORATING ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. WILSON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. RADANOVICH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Madam Speaker, I am thankful for the opportunity to speak on this most important occasion.

I am proud to be here this evening to honor my Armenian friends—particularly on the eve of the 85th anniversary of the Armenian Genocide. I want to associate my comments with an article that I recently read in the *Jerusalem Post*, which said . . . “The 1915 wholesale massacre of Armenians by the Ottoman Turks remains a core experience of the Armenian nation . . . While there is virtually zero tolerance for Holocaust denial, there is tacit acceptance of the denial of the Armenian genocide in part because ‘the Turks have managed to structure this debate so that people question whether this really happened . . .’” Well we know that the death of 1.5 million Armenians by execution or starvation really happened, and we know that we must not tolerate this denial.

In fact we have an obligation to educate and familiarize Americans with the U.S. record on the Armenian Genocide. As Members of Congress, we must ensure that the legacy of the genocide is remembered so that this human tragedy will not be repeated. Toward that end I have sponsored H. Res. 398, the “United States Training on and Commemoration of the Armenian Genocide Resolution.”

This bipartisan resolution calls upon the President to provide for appropriate training and materials to all Foreign Service officers, officials of the Department of State, and any other Executive Branch employee involved in responding to issues related to human rights, ethnic cleansing, and genocide. As we have seen in recent years, genocide and ethnic cleansing continues to plague nations around the world, and as a great nation, we must always be attentive and willing to stand against such atrocities.

My resolution also calls upon the President in the President's annual message commemorating the Armenian Genocide to characterize the systematic and deliberate annihilation of the 1.5 million Armenians as genocide, and to recall the proud history of the United States intervention in opposition to the Armenian Genocide.

I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting this important legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HORN. Madam Speaker, I stand before my colleagues today, as I have in times past, to recognize and pay tribute to those who perished during the Armenian Genocide that began almost nine decades ago.

Turkey's continued refusal to acknowledge the atrocities committed against the Armenian people of the Ottoman Empire during the first World

War has long been of great concern to me as an educator, a United States representative, and simply as a member of the global community.

Each year many colleagues take this special opportunity to recognize the fact that more than a million and a half Armenians were killed. In addition, much of the Armenian population was forcibly deported. This day coming up, April 24, is an opportunity to remind all Americans to join with the Armenians at home and in the United States in commemoration and memory of those who lost their lives because of the tragic events that took place from 1915 to 1918 and again from 1920 to 1923.

As an educator, it is important to emphasize the role education should play nationally, as well as globally, in ensuring that we do not continue to see racial intolerance or religious persecution which has in so many cases led to so-called ethnic cleansing by murderous and perverted butchers. What an outrage for humans to treat other humans such human killers of small children.

Genocide is not just a chapter in the history of humankind that has been sealed and closed forever. It continues to be a progressively alarming problem today, as our world grows smaller and our population doubles every few years.

Events during the last two decades, Cambodia, Rwanda, Kosovo attest to this fact. We must, therefore, strive to teach our children tolerance. Our future generations must not forget those darker moments of history in the 21st century. The million and a half Armenians, the 6 million Jews murdered by Adolph Hitler's orders, the 2 million Cambodians murdered by Pol Pot's orders.

As long as Turkey continues to deny that millions of Armenians were killed simply because of their ethnic identification, we will continue to stand here and take this important opportunity to ensure that the memory of the Armenian Genocide is not forgotten.

Madam Speaker, educators around the country should use April 24, a day that a group of Armenian religious, political, and intellectual leaders were arrested in Constantinople and brutally murdered by Turkish killers. It is essential to cultivate awareness in our children of the past tragedies that have occurred.

If we do not see the future dangers that will exist, if we refuse to acknowledge, understand and vigorously oppose racial and religious intolerance, wherever it arises, it would be shame on us and it shall not be.

HIGH COSTS OF PRESCRIPTION DRUGS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BERRY. Madam Speaker, I rise once again to address the high costs of prescription drugs in this country, and

the recently released Republican plan that will do absolutely nothing to help the people of this country, especially our senior citizens, who are struggling with these high prescription drug prices.

The Republicans have finally released that the seniors in their districts and across this country are struggling with these high prescription drug prices. So they came up with a plan, a phony plan, one that does not guarantee our seniors affordable prescription drugs. It does provide a plan to protect the profits of the prescription drug manufacturers in this country. They say that the seniors will be able to buy private prescription drug plans. Do these private plans mean that seniors will be able to afford their medicines?

Madam Speaker, there is nothing in their plan that does that. The GAO proposal creates a brand new bureaucracy, a very inefficient counterproductive system for providing and subsidizing a drug benefit. We know that we need to provide a drug benefit for our senior citizens, particularly those on Medicare.

A recently released White House report shows that 43 percent of rural residents on Medicare have no prescription drug coverage. Those without coverage pay nearly twice as much out of pocket as anyone else. The report is just another justification that seniors need a good prescription drug benefit under Medicare. They need access to lower-priced prescription drugs, like all the rest of the world has. Americans without a prescription drug benefit spend more for their medicine than anyone else in the world.

The prescription drug manufacturers are now running ads under the guise of Citizens for Better Medicare. This is a front group for the manufacturers. This ad claims that if you allow a reasonably-priced prescription drug to be sold in this country at relatively the same price that it sold in other countries that you threaten the research and development, the fact is, in countries where they sell these products for half as much as they do in America, they are increasing their research and development faster than they are in the United States. This just simply does not make any sense.

They say that to allow Americans to purchase prescription drugs at reasonable prices and at fair prices, like all the rest of the world has, that it would create a situation where our health care system would be in danger and that we would end up with a bad system. There is nothing to that.

This is just an attempt to frighten the senior citizens to think that they may not have access at all to good medication. The fact is what the fright should be, what the fright is, the manufacturers are fearful that they will lose their exorbitant profits that they squeeze from the pockets of our senior citizens in this country every day.

Their new ad claims that their intention is to import Canada's government controls.

The truth is, Canada is now utilizing the purchasing power of the U.S. government. One way the Canadian government keeps brand name drug companies from price gauging is to see at what price drug companies sell their products in other countries.

In Canada, the price cannot exceed the median price charged in other developing countries. Starting this year, the U.S. price Canada will use in the international comparisons is the U.S. Federal supply schedule price. We now have Canadians benefitting from the purchasing power of the United States Government. But Americans cannot benefit from that. This is an outrage that Canadians can benefit from U.S. Government discount that we refuse to give our own Medicare recipients.

I have introduced legislation that would give U.S. seniors access to lower prescription drug prices that seniors in all other countries enjoy, the International Prescription Drug Parity Act. The senior citizens in the district that I am fortunate to represent and in every district know that they are simply being robbed.

Senior citizens across this country expect every Member of Congress to address this situation. Addressing the issues of cost and affordability for prescription drugs as well as finding a reasonable approach to offering drug coverage to Medicare recipients is absolutely essential.

TRAGIC LOSS OF U.S. MARINES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, this past Saturday evening, we suffered a tragic loss in America when a Marine Corps V-22 Osprey crashed in a test mode and killed all 19 Marines on board the aircraft, a tragic loss of life.

All America has joined with the Commandant of the Marine Corps, General Jones; the leaders in the Pentagon; and the President in mourning the loss of these brave Americans.

This tragic incident is now under full investigation. Today I arranged for a full briefing for our colleagues where the Marine Corps presented a full up-to-date assessment as to what has taken place, what facts we know about the incident, and what initial thoughts are occurring in terms of what caused the accident.

It is obviously too early to tell, but we expect that within a few weeks we will know the basis upon which a decision can be made about the cause of this terribly tragic accident.

But, Madam Speaker, before we even removed all of the remains of these brave Marines, we have political opportunists around the country taking shots at the program and making wild and outlandish statements.

One such person, Madam Speaker, is a former Reagan Republican officeholder who served as Assistant Secretary of Defense by the name of Lawrence Korb. Mr. Korb wrote an op-ed in The New York Times on April 11 that is filled with misinformation factually incorrect, is a disservice to the Marine Corps, and to all brave Americans who wear the colors of this Nation.

He is the defense equivalent of an ambulance chaser. Before the investigation has even begun, he is trashing what General Jones calls the number-one priority of the Marine Corps, a capability to replace an aircraft, the CH-46 helicopter, that is 50 years old, was built for the Vietnam War, and which is suffering severe problems because of its age and because of its extended use well beyond the original life expectancy of the program.

In his article, Mr. Korb makes some gross statements that really are a disservice to the Corps and to all brave Marines serving this country. He says that this program was objected to by all senior officials from the Reagan, Bush, and Clinton administrations. That is absolutely incorrect. In fact, it was former Navy Secretary John Dalton would led the fight to keep the V-22 Osprey program alive for the Marine Corps and eventually all of our services.

He says in an article that these aircraft cost \$80 million each. When, if he would have checked his facts, he would have found that the cost is closer to \$40 million per copy and would be lower if we were buying an adequate buy of these aircraft as opposed to having them stretched out at a very low-rate buy. He assesses that Congress only supported the saving of this program because of the jobs that would be retained in America.

Well, I would say to Mr. Korb, either get his facts straight or keep his mouth shut. In fact, it was General Al Gray, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, who testified before Congress that he would never subject his warriors to what the opponents of the V-22 called a dual-sling option.

They said we will bolt two helicopters together and we will ask Marines to fly in those two helicopters to achieve the medium range over the rising capability that the V-22 offers.

Madam Speaker, the kind of rhetoric coming from people like Lawrence Korb is really a disgrace to the American service person and Mr. Korb ought to be ashamed of himself.

What we now need is, first of all, to mourn these families of these brave Marines. We need to let them know that we are going to do everything possible to take care of them and their loved ones and we are going to get to the bottom of what caused this incident. We will overturn every stone and we will use every bit of capability that we have to find out the cause of this terribly tragic accident. And we will relay this information to the families first, to Members of Congress, and then to the American public.

And then once we have all that have data, we will make a decision, we will make a decision based upon information and facts, not rhetoric to allow some columnist to score political points in the New York Times.

Madam Speaker, for the RECORD, I insert the following news release of the Marine Corps dated April 9; the statement of General Fred McCorkle, Deputy Chief of Staff for Aviation for the Marine Corps, dated April 11; and an updated information packet on the mishap, dated April 11 so that the American people can see the real facts of what occurred here as opposed to listening to incompetent people like Lawrence Korb.

[News Release, U.S. Marine Corps, April 9, 2000]

MV-22 MISHAP INVESTIGATION

HEADQUARTERS MARINE CORPS, WASHINGTON, DC.—The Marine Corps is sending an aircraft mishap investigation team, headed by Colonel Dennis Bartels of Headquarters, Marine Corps, to Marana, AZ to determine the cause of Saturday night's crash of an MV-22 Osprey that took the lives of all 19 Marines aboard.

"The entire Marine Corps family grieves for the Marines we've lost in this tragedy and our thoughts and prayers go out to their families," said Gen. James Jones, Commandant of the Marine Corps. "We have sent an expert team to Arizona to quickly investigate the circumstances surrounding this mishap."

Secretary of the Navy Richard Danzig today released the following statement, "Evaluating new equipment and training for war, like war itself, puts life at risk. In peace and war, Marines accept that risk—it is a bond between us. In that spirit, we grieve today for our nineteen lost Marines and embrace their families."

The MV-22 was conducting a training mission in support of Operational Evaluation (OPEVAL) when it went down near Marana, AZ. During the mission, the crew and Marines conducted Non-combatant Evacuation Operations (NEO) exercises as part of the Weapons and Tactics Instructor course, with Marines embarking and disembarking the aircraft. The mission was conducted at night utilizing night vision goggles (NVGs) and forward-looking infrared radar (FLIR) to enhance night operational capability.

Operational Evaluation is a test phase to determine the operational suitability of the aircraft for the Marine Corps. It began in October 1999 and is scheduled to conclude in June 2000.

To date, the four Ospreys involved in Operational Evaluation have completed more than 800 flight hours. During March, the OPEVAL aircraft flew nearly 140 flight hours, an average of 35 hours per aircraft.

The mishap aircraft was part of the Multi-service Operational Test Team, based at Patuxent River, MD, but was temporarily attached to Marine Aviation Weapons and Tactics Squadron-1 at Marine Corps Air Station Yuma, AZ.

The names of the deceased are being withheld pending notification of next of kin.

[News Release, U.S. Marine Corps, April 9, 2000]

NAMES OF ACCIDENT VICTIMS RELEASED

HEADQUARTERS MARINE CORPS, WASHINGTON, DC.—Marine Corps officials are expressing condolences to the families of 19 Marines killed approximately 8 p.m. last night when an MV-22 Osprey crashed near Marana, Ariz.

Killed in the accident were:

Sgt. Jose Alvarez, 28, a machinegunner assigned to 3d Battalion, 5th Marine Regiment, 1st Marine Division, of Uvalde, Texas.

Maj. John A. Brow, 39, a pilot assigned to Marine Helicopter Squadron-1, of California, Md.

PFC Gabriel C. Clevenger, 21, a machinegunner assigned to 3d Battalion, 5th Marine Regiment, 1st Marine Division, of Picher, Okla.

PFC Alfred Corona, 23, a machinegunner assigned to 3d Battalion, 5th Marine Regiment, 1st Marine Division, of San Antonio, Texas.

Lance Corporal Jason T. Duke, 28, a machinegunner assigned to 3d Battalion, 5th Marine Regiment, 1st Marine Division, of Sacramento, Calif.

Lance Corporal Jesus Gonzales Sanchez, 27, an assaultman assigned to 3d Battalion, 5th Marine Regiment, 1st Marine Division, of San Diego, Calif.

Maj. Brooks S. Gruber, 34, a pilot assigned to Marine Helicopter Squadron-1, of Jacksonville, NC.

Lance Corporal Seth G. Jones, 18, an assaultman assigned to 3d Battalion, 5th Marine Regiment, 1st Marine Division, of Bend, Ore.

2nd Lieutenant Clayton J. Kennedy, 24, a platoon commander assigned to 3d Battalion, 5th Marine Regiment, 1st Marine Division, of Clifton Bosque, Texas.

Cpl. Kelly S. Keith, 22, aircraft crew chief assigned to Marine Helicopter Squadron-1, of Florence, SC.

Cpl. Eric J. Martinez, 21, a field radio operator assigned to Marine Wing Communications Squadron 38, Marine Air Control Group 38, of Coconino, Ariz.

Lance Corporal Jorge A. Morin, 21, an assaultman assigned to 3d Battalion, 5th Marine Regiment, 1st Marine Division, of McAllen, Texas.

Corporal Adam C. Neely, 22, a rifleman assigned to 3d Battalion, 5th Marine Regiment, 1st Marine Division, of Winthrop, Wash.

Staff Sgt. William B. Nelson, 30, a satellite communications specialist with Marine Air Control Group-38, of Richmond, Va.

PFC Kenneth O. Paddio, 23, a rifleman assigned to 3d Battalion, 5th Marine Regiment, 1st Marine Division, of Houston, Texas.

PFC George P. Santos, 19, a rifleman assigned to 3d Battalion, 5th Marine Regiment, 1st Marine Division, of Long Beach, Calif.

PFC Keoki P. Santos, 24, a rifleman assigned to 3d Battalion, 5th Marine Regiment, 1st Marine Division, of Grand Ronde, Ore.

Corporal Can Soler, 21, a rifleman assigned to 3d Battalion, 5th Marine Regiment, 1st Marine Division, of Palm City, Fla.

Pvt. Adam L. Tatro, 19, a rifleman assigned to 3d Battalion, 5th Marine Regiment, 1st Marine Division, of Brownwood, Texas.

"The entire Marine Corps family grieves for the Marines we've lost in this tragedy and our thoughts and prayers go out to their families," said Gen. James Jones, Commandant of the Marine Corps. "We have sent an expert team to Arizona to quickly investigate the circumstances surrounding this mishap."

Secretary of the Navy Richard Danzig today released the following statement, "Evaluating new equipment and training for war, like war itself, puts life at risk. In peace and war, Marines accept that risk—it is a bond between us. In that spirit, we grieve today for our nineteen lost Marines and embrace their families."

The MV-22 was conducting a training mission in support of Operational Evaluation (OPEVAL) when it went down near Marana, Ariz. During the mission, the crew and Marines conducted Non-combatant Evacuation Operation (NEO) exercises as part of the

Weapons and Tactics Instructor Course, with Marines embarking and disembarking the aircraft. The mission was conducted at night utilizing night vision goggles and forward-looking infrared radar to enhance night operational capability.

Operational Evaluation is a test phase to determine the operational suitability of the aircraft for the Marine Corps. It began in October 1999 and is scheduled to conclude in June 2000.

To date, the four Ospreys involved in Operational Evaluation have completed more than 800 flight hours. During March, the OPEVAL aircraft flew nearly 140 flight hours, an average of 35 hours per aircraft.

The mishap aircraft was part of the Multi-service Operational Test Team, based at Patuxent River, Md., but was temporarily attached to Marine Aviation Weapons and Tactics Squadron-1 at Marine Corps Air Station Yuma, Ariz.

PREPARED STATEMENT ON MV-22 MISHAP BY LTGEN FRED MCCORKLE, HEADQUARTERS MARINE CORPS (APRIL 11, 2000)

First and foremost, I would like to say that our thoughts and prayers are with the families of our Marines who were tragically taken from us Saturday night. Obviously, there are no words that can express our sadness and sense of loss in this situation. Our Marine Corps is a tight-knit family, and each of us feels the loss of these Marines. We are with the families now and we will continue to assist them in the difficult days ahead. Our number one concern at this time is their well-being.

While the mishap is currently under investigation, there are some things I would like to relay to you and then I will answer whatever questions I can.

The Commandant has sent Col Dennis Bartels from our staff to lead the expert investigation team. I spoke with Col Bartels last night and he has assured me that the investigation is well underway. There is, however, no determination at this time as to the cause of the mishap. Let me emphatically state that we are committed to finding the truth. One thing I want to clarify from my comments yesterday, the incident was observed on an F/A-18 FLIR but it was not videotaped.

The aircraft was the second in a flight of two aircraft conducting a simulated evacuation operation. It was one of four MV-22s participating in this exercise to support Operational Evaluations (OpEval). OpEval is a DOD requirement specifically designed to validate an aircraft's operational capability to support USMC missions. It requires flights in operational configurations to include flights with embarked troops.

Our most precious asset is our Marines and their welfare is the primary concern of all Marines in leadership positions. Numerous senior service members and members of Congress have flown in the aircraft. I have flown the aircraft and believe it to be safe. It is important to stress that the MV-22 is not an experimental test aircraft. The MV-22 is a proven technology. The Osprey has already completed extensive flight testing that included:

Almost 1200 flight hours of Full Scale Development (1-6), and

1600 flight hours of Engineering/Manufacturing Development (7-10).

The mishap aircraft was one of five production aircraft delivered to the Marine Corps for operational use. The four aircraft participating in OpEval, all delivered in the past 11 months, have accumulated over 840 flight hours conducting operational flights in support of OpEval. This particular aircraft was delivered to the Marine Corps in January of

this year and had been flown over 135 hours to date. The total amount of flight time accumulated by MV-22s to date is over 3600 hours.

The two pilots flying the aircraft were very experienced, veteran pilots from Marine Helicopter Squadron One. One had nearly 3800 hours and the other had over 2100 hours. Both pilots were approaching 100 hours of flight time in the MV-22 and had over 100 MV-22 simulator hours. Additionally, the aircraft was crewed by two of our very finest enlisted Marines.

The aircraft is equipped with a Crash Survivable Memory Unit (CSMU) that records 227 separate aircraft parameters that should provide invaluable insight into the cause of this mishap. These parameters include aircraft performance data (airspeed, altitude, heading, etc), engine performance data and information on any potential system malfunctions indicated. Efforts to retrieve this component from the aircraft are ongoing.

We are distributing a photo of the Marana Northwest Regional Airport that depicts the intended point of landing for the flight of the two aircraft involved. This package also contains a data sheet and information relating to the exercise being conducted.

Throughout this tragic and challenging time, we have been supported by a number of local law enforcement agencies, fire departments and National Guard and reserve units in Arizona. The American Red Cross continues to provide support on the scene. We truly appreciate their superb support in these efforts to take care of our Marines.

Our work as Marines comes with some danger and risks, but we strive to do everything we can to minimize those risks. As Secretary Danzig so aptly stated Sunday, "Evaluating new equipment and training for war, like war itself, puts life at risk. In peace and war, Marines accept that risk—it is a bond between us. In that spirit we grieve today for our lost Marines."

Finally, I would like to conclude by again saying that our thoughts and prayers are with the families of our fallen Marines. We are taking care of the families now and will continue to assist them in every way possible in the difficult days ahead. I will now answer what questions I can at this point.

MV-22 MISHAP INFORMATION

The MV-22 mishap occurred approximately 8 p.m. Saturday night 8 April when a MV-22 Osprey crashed near Tucson, Arizona. The MV-22 was conducting a training mission in support of Operational Evaluation (OPEVAL). Aircraft was second aircraft in two ship flight inbound Marana Northwest Regional Airport (encl 1) about 15 miles NW of Tucson, Arizona. The landing site was a hard surface concrete pad area, free of obstacles and parallel to a 6,900' runway. Safety personnel had conducted a safety site survey and a daytime landing there to ensure suitability.

This mishap aircraft was part of the Multi-service Operational Test Team (MOTT), based at Patuxent River, Md., but was temporarily attached to Marine Aviation Weapons and Tactics Squadron-1 (MAWTS-1) at Marine Corps Air station Yuma, Ariz. OPEVAL commenced in November 1999 with planned completion data of June 2000. OPEVAL is being conducted by the MOTT under the auspices of Commanding Officer, HMX-1, the Marine Corps' aviation OPEVAL agency. In this capacity, CO, HMX-1 reports to Commander Operational Test and Evaluation Force. OPEVAL determines aircraft effectiveness and suitability and must be conducted to the maximum extent possible under the most realistic conditions (DOD 5000.2).

During the mission, the crew and Marines conducted Non-combatant Evacuation Operations (NEO) exercises as part of the Weapons and Tactics Instructor (WTI) Course, with Marines embarking and disembarking the aircraft. The mission profile called for the utilization of the latest version of Night Vision Goggles, (ANVIS-9) and Forward-Looking Infrared Radar to enhance night operational capability. Flight was undertaken in good weather conditions with 17 percent illumination. The flight also served as a training vehicle for the MAWTS current WTI course designated as Assault Support Mission 3 (encl 2). Non-aircrew personnel aboard were part of the Evacuation Control Center for the simulated NEO.

The mishap aircraft was not an experimental aircraft. The aircraft was the fourth of five production aircraft delivered to the Marine Corps. Formal developmental testing of the MV-22 was conducted on the Full Scale Development aircraft (aircraft 1-6) flying 1184 flt hrs and the Engineering and Manufacturing Development aircraft (aircraft 7-10) flying 1600 flt hrs. The mishap aircraft was a Low Rate Initial Production aircraft (aircraft 11-15). The LRIP aircraft have flown a total of 840 flt hrs conducting operational/mission training and evaluation. The MV-22 fleet have flown a total of 3624 flt hrs. The mishap aircraft had flown 135.5 flight hrs since it was delivered to the Marine Corps on 17 Jan 00.

The two previous MV-22 testing mishaps demonstrated the risks inherent in any flight test development program, but the mishap causes were not unique to "tiltrotor technology." The last mishap was in July 1992. The identified design deficiencies were corrected and incorporated in all production aircraft. The MV-22 fleet has flown over 2400 hours (2/3 of all hours) since the last mishap in 1992.

A complete Aviation Mishap Board (AMB) has been convened in Tucson under in accordance with OPNAVINST 3750 under the direction of Col Dennis Bartels from Dept of Avn, HQMC. Team is being supported by joint agencies and the entire Naval Aviation establishment.

Although MV-22s have not been grounded by Commander Naval Air Systems Command, operations have been suspended in order to evaluate the current situation and determine the most appropriate course of action and safe flight operations.

REMAINS—8 REMAINS HAD BEEN RECOVERED BY
1500, 11 APRIL 2000

—The recovery of remains will be done as quickly as possible given the circumstances and requirements to properly identify the Marines and preserve evidence at the crash site.

—15 Aviation Mishap Board personnel on scene.

—15 Naval Aviation Center Personnel on scene.

—Human Resources Personnel from Davis-Monthan.

—Counselors on site to assist.

—HMX-1 Flight Surgeon on site.

—Marine Reserve Unit providing security (6th Eng Spt BN Det A Bulk Fuel).

—Locals have constructed a memorial with flowers.

—There are two Armed Forces Medical Examiners on site.

—10 Trained mortuary affairs personnel from the U.S. Air Force and Armed Forces Institute of Pathology arrived from Washington, DC, Monday.

—Recovery efforts began 0800 this morning.

—Once remains have been properly removed, they will be transferred to Davis-Monthan Air Force Base for shipment to Dover Air Force Base, Delaware.

—Dover serves as the Port Mortuary for all Services.

—At Dover, the remains will be met by Marines from the Marine Barracks Washington, DC.

—After the remains have been identified, they will be assigned an escort (either someone from the Marines' unit or someone designated by the family).

—Memorial services will be held at NAS Patuxent River, MD next week and Camp Pendleton on Monday 17th. Exact times and dates are being coordinated.

—MCAS New River has tentatively scheduled a memorial for the four aircrew at 1400 this Friday.

—If DNA analysis is required, a sample will be taken from the remains at Dover and testing will be done at Rockville, Maryland Institute of Pathology.

—All Marines on board are entitled to be buried at Arlington National Cemetery if the family so desires.

MAWTS-1—ASSAULT SUPPORT TACTICS THREE

Assault Support Tactics Three (AST III) is a long range (180 NM radius) multiple site Noncombatant Evacuation Operation (NEO) conducted at night (on NVGs) in the Phoenix and Tucson Arizona areas. A "real world" scenario forms the two day evolution which is the culmination of the AST Common flight phase of the Weapons and Tactics Instructors (WTI Course) taught at Marine Aviation Weapons and Tactics Squadron One. Additionally, the NEO completes the WTI course's Military Operations in an Urban Terrain (MOUT) package introduced earlier during the Common academics phase.

This particular WTI mission requires a sizeable airborne package consisting of mostly helicopters. Specific numbers for WTI 2-00 are: (7) CH-46Es, (5) CH-53Es, (2) CH-53Ds, (5) AH-1Ws, 1 UH-1N, (3) FA-18Ds, (4) MV-22s, (3) KC-130s for a total of 30 aircraft supporting the NEO. Besides the aircraft required to support the mission a Forward Operating Base (FOB) is established at Gila Bend Air Force Auxiliary Airfield. The FOB is guarded by Stinger Teams, facilitates a Marine Air Traffic Control Mobile Team (MMT), a MWCS Communications Detachment using high power HF, VHF SINGARS, and SATCOM. A Forward Arming and Refueling Point (FARP) is also established at the FOB employing KC-130's Rapid Ground Refueling (RGR) systems. The Tactical Bulk Fuel Dispensing System (TBFDS) is also employed on a CH-53E at a separate austere site to refuel the AH-1Ws and UH-1N.

During the execution, three separate task forces pull evacuees from three different sites located in Phoenix and Tucson. The American citizens once evacuated and repositioned at the FOB where a complete Evacuation Control Center (ECC) completes the processing. Once processing is complete, the KC-130s lift the evacuees back to Yuma, AZ. MAWTS-1 staff members make up the Forward Command Element (FCE). An infantry company that supports WTI make up the security elements and man the ECC at the FOB's consolidation site. Additional Marines dressed in civilian attire make up the non-combatants—totaling up to eighty evacuees. As the mission progresses, all information is relayed through the established command and control system including a Direct Air Support Center (DASC) and DASC(A), an Assault Support Coordinator Airborne (ASC(A)) assists in control of the mission while "real time" information is fed back to the Tactical Air Command Center (TACC). Situational awareness is maintained in the TAC—nearly two hundred miles from the further site!

The NEO training received at MAWTS-1, during the WTI course, is critical since no

where else in the FMF are NEOs practiced to such an extent and magnitude—except during a real contingency.

CMC MISHAP UPDATE FOR 11 APR 2000

AVIATION

—Recovery of remains started 0800 this morning

—Ten bodies recovered as of 1500 11 April

—Should get at least 4 more today

—Crew chief identified by equipment and uniform

—Expect to be complete by 12 April

—Remains to be flown from Davis-Monthan AFB to Dover

—Autopsies and DNA sampling to commence upon return to East Coast

—All Aircraft Mishap Board members and augmentees on site at Marana, AZ

—Armed Forces Institute of Pathology—12 personnel

2 Medical Examiners

10 Mortuary Affairs personnel

—JAG Manual investigators (LtCol Morgan and LtCol (Sel) Radich) from Quantico on scene 11 April

—MOTT (85 Pax) to be transported by C-9 from MCAS Yuma to Pax River Wednesday; C-130 to return team from memorial service at New River to Yuman on Saturday, Pending aircraft status, original test plan called for OPEVAL to resume at China Lake on Sunday

—Aircraft presently cleared for ground turns and taxiing as of 11 April

LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS

—Briefing requested by Rep. Curt Weldon (R, PA 7th Dist.) and others by LtGen. McCorkle set for 1000, 12 April

—Offer made by OLA to Senate side for similar briefing in PM on 12 April if desired

PUBLIC AFFAIRS

—Have received over 1000 media inquiries since the mishap

—LtGen. McCorkle's preliminary press conference 1630 on 10 April

—LtGen. McCorkle gave statement and answered reporters questions at DOD nationally televised press conference at 1330 on 11 April

—Daily briefings at 1430 at the crash site with Maj. Dave Anderson

—Once barriers erected at crash site, most press departed

V-22 "OSPREY" KEY FACTS

The V-22 OSPREY is a joint service, multi-mission, vertical/short take-off and landing tiltrotor aircraft. It performs a wide range of VTOL missions as effective as a conventional helicopter while achieving the long-range cruise efficiencies of a twin turboprop aircraft. The MV-22 will be the Marine Corps' medium lift aircraft, replacing the aging fleet of CH-46 and CH-53D helicopters. The Air Force variant, the CV-22, will replace the MH-53J and MH-60G and augment the MC-130 fleet in the USSOCOM Special Operations mission. The V-22, which is jointly produced by Bell Helicopter Textron and the Boeing Company, is the world's first production tiltrotor aircraft.

FEATURES AND BENEFITS

- Incorporates mature, but advanced technologies in composite materials, survivability, airfoil design, fly-by-wire controls, digital cockpit and manufacturing.

- Has two 38-foot diameter "prop-rotors." Engine/transmission nacelles mounted on the end of each wing rotate through 95 degrees. Combines vertical takeoff and landing of a helicopter with the long range, high speed and efficiency of a turboprop airplane.

- This unique aircraft transitions from the helicopter flying mode to a fixed wing flying mode in less than 20 seconds.

- Speed, range, and payload expand capabilities beyond the limits of helicopter technology.

- Self deployable worldwide, ferry range of 2,100 NM with one aerial refueling.

- Can fly at speeds from hover to 300 knots, cruises at 250 knots.

- Increased speed, maneuverability and reduced vulnerability make it much more survivable in combat than the helicopters it is replacing.

- Carries up to 24 fully combat loaded Marines internally or 10,000 pounds externally.

- Performs missions relevant to post Cold War era:

- Amphibious landing
- Noncombatant evacuation
- Tactical recovery of aircraft and personnel
- Humanitarian relief
- Transporting troops into combat
- Long-range special operations night/all weather

Provides all the above faster from further distances with more survivability than a helicopter

SCHEDULE

- Marine Medium Tiltrotor Training Squadron (VMMT-204) designated June 1999
- Initial operational capability for the Marine Corps—2001

- First USMC fleet squadron scheduled deployment—2003

- USAF Initial operational capability—2004

- Service buys: Marine Corps 360 MV-22s, Air Force 50 CV-22s, Navy 48 HV-22s

1830

ARMENIAN GENOCIDE COMMEMORATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. WILSON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam Speaker, every year we come to the House floor to commemorate and pay tribute to the 1.5 million victims of the Armenian Genocide. Sadly, 85 years after the tragedy began, Turkey still refuses to recognize the Armenian Genocide and apologize for the atrocious acts it committed. Since 1923, Turkey has denied the Armenian Genocide despite overwhelming documentation, and since 1923 there has been no justice for the victims and the families of the victims of the Armenian Genocide.

To those who continue to resist the truth, I can only believe that they have chosen to ignore the hard evidence or to indulge their shame by ignoring the facts. Like the Holocaust, denying the Armenian Genocide cannot erase the tragedy, the lives that were lost, or compensate for driving people from their homeland. For the people of Armenia, the fight continues today, particularly for the Armenians of Nagorno-Karabagh, who are impacted by modern day Turkey and Azerbaijan's aggression toward Armenia in the form of the Azeri blockade against Nagorno-Karabagh. But their actions are not without consequences.

I believe the Congress will continue to provide assistance to the people residing in Nagorno-Karabagh, and we will continue to uphold section 907 of

the Freedom Support Act that denies assistance to Azerbaijan until they end their stranglehold on Nagorno-Karabagh. Our message to Turkey and Azerbaijan must be loud and clear. We will not stand by as you once again seek to threaten the Armenian people.

For my part, I will continue to support assistance to improve the lives of all Armenians; I will continue to remember those who have lost their lives, and continue to commemorate this somber occasion. Lastly, I will continue to hold the Turkish and Azeri governments responsible for their actions past and present. For this reason, I have joined as a cosponsor of House Resolution 398, commemorating the genocide and calling on the President to characterize in his annual message commemorating the Armenian Genocide, the systematic and deliberate annihilation of 1.5 million Armenians as genocide and to recall the proud history of the United States intervention in opposition to that genocide.

I am hopeful that we will see the day when peace, stability, and prosperity are realized for the people of Nagorno-Karabagh and for all Armenians. But until then, the United States Congress must continue to be on the side of what is right, what is just and continue to assist to make sure that history does not repeat itself.

PRESCRIPTION DRUGS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. STABENOW. Madam Speaker, I come today to talk about what I believe is one of the most challenging if not the most challenging issues affecting our seniors and affecting many families across the country. This was spoken to a while ago by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY), who spoke very eloquently about the challenges of seniors related to the cost of prescription drugs.

What we have seen over the years is a system that started in 1965 under Medicare that has been a great American success story. In 1965, half of our seniors could not find insurance or could not afford health care insurance. Now we have a system for health care for seniors. The challenge before us is that health care has changed, the way we provide health care has changed. In 1965 we were predominantly providing health care in hospitals with surgeries, and the use of drugs was limited to the hospital.

Today, we know that care has changed; and we see home health care, we see outpatient care, and a great reliance on new prescription drugs, wonderful medications that we are very pleased and proud to have developed in the United States. But at the same time we are seeing a growing disparity and a horrible situation for too many

seniors who literally on a daily basis are deciding do I buy my food today, do I get my medications, do I pay the electric bill, how can I keep going and remain healthy and well by having access to my medications? Because Medicare does not currently cover the costs of prescription drugs.

I rise today to urge my colleagues as quickly as possible, we are long overdue, in correcting this problem. We have economic good times. There is no reason that we cannot at this time get it right for Medicare, modernize Medicare, to cover the way health care is provided today; and that means covering the cost of prescription drugs. We are in economic good times, and I believe in these times we have obligations to pay our bills and pay our debts and to keep our commitments.

One of the most important commitments that we have made to older Americans is Medicare, health care for them. Social Security is another commitment, health care for our veterans, all important commitments that we have made. But because of the challenge that I have heard from too many of my constituents all across Michigan, I began months ago putting together something called the Prescription Drug Fairness Campaign. I have asked seniors and families to share with me their stories, if they are having difficulty paying for their medications to call a hotline that I set up for them to share their stories with me, or for them to send me letters and copies of their high prescription drug bills so that we can put a real face and a name and a situation on this problem.

This is not an issue made up by people on the floor of this House or by other politicians. This is an issue that is real for every senior and every family in this country. One of the things that disturbs me the most is the fact that we see such a disparity in pricing. As the gentleman from Arkansas mentioned earlier, we have a situation where if you go to another country, in my State we are right next to Canada in Michigan, I included a bus trip, I invited a number of seniors to join me, to go across the Ambassador Bridge from Detroit to Windsor; and we dropped their costs by 53 percent by crossing the bridge.

There is something wrong when there can be such a disparity. And when you add to that the fact that we are precluded by American law from bringing those drugs, mail order or bringing those medications routinely across the border without seeing a Canadian physician first and going through the Canadian process, we cannot reimport those drugs back into the United States, American-made FDA approved, because of protections that were put into the law in 1987 to protect our own pharmaceutical drug companies who are making the drugs here and benefiting from our research and development and the institutions that we have, the tax system we have that provides tax incentives and tax write-offs,

which I support, I think it is important and good public policy for us to have an R&D tax credit, I think we need to keep it; but they benefit from that, sell to other countries, and then people are not even allowed to bring that back, to reimport it, without going through the process of seeing a Canadian physician and going through the Canadian health system.

I have also done other studies in my district that have shown that if you have insurance, if you have an HMO or other kinds of insurance, you are paying half on average what an uninsured senior or uninsured person is paying for their medical care, for their medicines. So we see seniors who use two-thirds of the medications in this country who do not have insurance and then because others get discounts because they are negotiating group discounts, they do not get those discounts, so they not only do not have insurance but they pay more on top of that, paying twice as much as somebody with insurance. It is crazy.

We have done another comparison as some others of my colleagues have that have shown that there are medications that are provided for animals as well as for people where in those cases where there is arthritis medication, heart medication, high blood pressure medication, we compared eight different medications to find that the same name, the same drug, the same quality controls and it costs half if you go to get it for your pet than it does for you to walk into the pharmacy, and we see the same medication. There is something wrong with this picture. We need to make sure that Medicare covers costs of prescription drugs, we modernize it to cover the way health care is provided, and then we need to get busy to make sure that we are lowering the cost of prescription drugs for all of our families.

I would like to share this evening three different letters that I have received from people around Michigan sharing their stories. I have made a commitment to the seniors of Michigan that I will come to this floor, I will share stories once a week every week until we fix this. Let me share with my colleagues this evening starting with Delores Graychek from Indian River, Michigan. Delores writes and sends me information as follows:

"I heard you talk on TV on January 26 and something does need to be done to help all of us out here that's on seven or eight medications like I am and have no help to pay for them. I picked up six of my seven meds yesterday. The total came to \$274.78. That is more than my Social Security check. More than my Social Security check. Each month we get deeper in debt and soon we will be like a lot of other older people. We won't have anything left. We also are paying on hospital bills for me. I had open heart surgery last November. So by the time all of our bills come in, our Social Security checks are gone. I think it's a shame our gold-

en years aren't golden after all. Thank you for what you're trying to do.

Truly, Delores Graychek, Indian River, Michigan."

I want to thank Delores. She is right. Her golden years should be golden. It is up to us in the Congress to step up and to get it right. If we do not do this in economic good times, we never will. Now is the time to step up and cover prescription drugs under Medicare.

Let me cover another letter that I want to thank Joseph and Ethyl Korn from Marquette, Michigan, in the great upper peninsula of Michigan for writing and sharing this with me.

Dear Congresswoman Stabenow:

My husband and I have an enormous hardship with our prescription bills. Joe, who's a World War II veteran, fought to save our country. He has Parkinson's, mini-strokes, diverticulosis and deep depression. I have high blood pressure and I take my medicine, when I can afford it, including Premarin for my bones. Here is our prescription bill for what we can afford, and you can see I don't get all of mine. Oh, yes, I also have glaucoma and I need eye drops. This is Joseph and Ethyl M. Korn at the Snowbury Heights Retirement Home in Marquette, Michigan.

Mr. COBURN. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Ms. STABENOW. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. I think it is important for us to know, the lady you just described is on Premarin which in this country, a generic has been waiting to be approved by the FDA for 5 years to sell at 20 percent of the price of what she is paying right now, the exact same drug.

Ms. STABENOW. I would reclaim my time and thank my colleague for that information and would be happy to join with him in the issue of generic drugs, as well, as we look at how we lower the costs of prescriptions, because there are a number of different strategies that need to happen today, that need to address how we bring more competition with generics, how we allow the prices to go down because we have Medicare negotiating a group discount.

Right now seniors do not have anybody. If they do not have private insurance, a senior citizen today does not have anybody negotiating a group discount for them while others do have people, whether it is insurance coverage or their HMO.

Let me also share the information: I do have enclosures that I appreciate Joe and Ethyl sending me their expenditures from January 1, 1999, until November 6, 1999. Mr. Korn's total prescription drug cost for this 10-month period was \$1,515.36. The total cost for Ethyl, who admits she cannot afford everything she needs, was \$324.02.

1845

One of my concerns I hear from friends of mine who are physicians are concerns that people are not purchasing what they need, or that they are taking it the wrong way. I had a physician in Michigan join me at an event and share the fact that he had

lost a patient because she was taking her medication every other day, instead of when she needed it, every day.

I have had stories of individuals talking to me about cutting their pills in half so they will last longer. This does not make sense. In our country, with the greatest innovations, the greatest health care innovations, the best research, we need to make sure that our seniors have access to these new medical options that are available, and are not picking between their food, paying their bills and their medicines, and that is what is happening with too many people today.

I want to share one more story, and that is Donald Booms from Lake City, Michigan. I very much appreciate Mr. Booms sharing his story with me as well.

Dear Congresswoman, recently I saw a story on TV about seniors not having insurance for prescription drugs. I am one of those people. I take three prescriptions daily and they cost about \$200 a month. My wife is currently on Blue Cross. She goes on Medicare in April of this year, which means she, too, will be without insurance for prescription drugs. She is a diabetic and takes seven prescriptions a day. Her costs will be about \$260 a month. Together we will be paying nearly \$500 a month for our prescription drugs. Together our Social Security checks are about \$1,100, minus \$300 for Medicare and Medigap insurance payments, and we have \$800 a month to live on. There surely does need to be something done with prescription drugs for seniors.

Thank you, Mr. Booms. There is something wrong when you are having to take \$500 out of \$800 a month in order to pay for your medications. Once again we are talking about a story of a couple on a fixed income, prior to retirement having access to health care and coverage, going into Medicare and retiring, and then finding themselves in the situation where they are taking the majority of the money that comes in every month just to pay for their medications.

I have hundreds of stories like this, hundreds of stories of people who are struggling every day to pay for their medications and to remain healthy.

When we took our trip to Canada, from Detroit to Windsor, there was a gentleman on the bus named George who is 79 years old, almost 80 years old. He continues to work in order to pay for \$20,000 a year in prescription and other health care costs for his wife. His wife is on 16 different medications, and he continues to work so that she can "live," as he puts it, so that she can remain with him. As he was telling me, there were tears in his eyes talking about how he had to keep working so that he could make sure his wife would remain with him and would be alive.

Another gentleman shared with me the fact that he takes one pill a month, and, because of our wonderful new innovations, which we are very appreciative of, that one pill allows him not

to have open heart surgery, but the one pill costs \$400.

When a pharmaceutical drug company comes forward and says that in order to be able to cover the cost of prescription drugs and address these high costs for seniors we would lose our research, that is just baloney. Twenty cents on every dollar that Mr. Booms or that the Korns are paying, 20 cents on every dollar is going to research. What we are seeing today is a whole new effort of advertising so that, as my colleague who talked about generic drugs said, the companies want to make sure we ask for the brand name. So we are paying more for advertising than for research.

So the reality is there is a way to get this right if we have the political will to do it. I believe, and I want to call on my colleague from Maine in a moment who has been such a leader as well in this issue, but I believe if we can solve Y2K, because it was a serious issue and we could not afford to let the lights go out and could not afford to let the computers go down, and brought all the American ingenuity together to fix what needed to be fixed, we did it. The lights were on January 1. Why can we not bring this same American ingenuity to help our seniors? Why can we not lower the cost of prescriptions and modernize Medicare to get it right? We can. I am going to be down here every week until we do it.

I yield now to my good friend the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding, and I want to thank the gentlewoman for her leadership on this issue. This is something that she and I have been working on now for, well, pretty close to 2 years, pretty close to 2 years, trying to bring the stories of these people, seniors all across this country and others who do not have prescription drug insurance, to the attention of this Congress. Although the issue is rising in terms of its coverage around the country, this Congress has yet to act.

I thought what I would do is talk about a few stories. A few of the stories were the stories that basically I heard when I first began, and they were simple stories, such as a retired firefighter in Sanford, Maine, standing up and telling me I spend \$200 a month now on my prescription medication. My doctor just told me I need another prescription. It costs \$100 a month, and I am not going to take it, because he could not possibly afford it.

Or the woman who wrote to me in July of 1998, the first of many, with a long list of her prescription drugs. She said in her letter here is a list of the medications that my husband and I are supposed to take. The bottom line was \$650. She said here is a copy of our two Social Security checks, which is all the monthly income we have. The bottom line was \$1,350.

That math does not work. You cannot have people who are taking in \$1,300 a month total income, expected

to spend \$650 of that for prescription drugs alone. They have got rent, food, heat, and utilities; and it does not work.

I have had women write to me and say I do not want my husband to know, but I am not taking my prescription medication because he is sicker than I am and we cannot both afford to take our medication.

It should not be like that in this country, and there is no reason why it should, but the truth is that 37 percent of all seniors have no coverage at all for prescription medication. Another 16 percent are in these wonderful HMOs that were supposed to provide free prescription drug coverage, and every year the benefits go down, the cap goes down, the premiums go up, and people are left paying more and more of their prescription coverage out of their own pockets.

About 8 percent of people have Medigap prescription drug coverage, but often the cap is about \$1,000 a year. That does not do much good for a lot of seniors in this country, who have several thousand dollars of prescription drug expenses in any one year.

Let me tell you about what we did in my district. I sent out a newsletter devoted entirely to health care. It dealt with veterans' care; it dealt with small businesses who were having trouble paying their premiums. It dealt with the veterans' health care, it dealt with seniors, it dealt with prescription drugs.

We got back 5,269 respondents, actually somewhat more than that. But we had a question in a questionnaire attached to this newsletter, and the question was, one of them, do you or your family member take a prescription drug on a regular basis? 4,089 people said yes. Of those 4,089, 1,726 said yes to the question do you have any difficulty paying for the drugs you or your family need? The truth of the matter is, people cannot do it.

We got back comments in response to those questionnaires. Here is one. A woman writes, "Dear Mr. Allen, do I need help. My Social Security check is \$736 a month. My medication is \$335 to \$350 a month. My Blue Cross, the supplemental insurance, is \$106 a month."

So she did the math. \$736 minus \$106 for Blue Cross, minus the \$350 for medication, left her \$280 to live on. And she said "my husband passed away last July."

Another woman wrote, "I am a site manager here at an elderly housing project. I have approximately 110 tenants. We are in low-income housing. It is a crime to see how many people forego their groceries to buy a prescription or forego the prescription so they can eat. Several of my folks here do not have any supplemental insurance and won't go for Medicaid, as they think it is welfare.

"Last March, my husband had an aneurism and had to have surgery. He survived it and was given 2 prescriptions. When I got to the pharmacy I

found they came to \$300. Needless to say, I didn't have that kind of money. I called his doctor. My doctor is very kind and gives me samples when he can. Otherwise, I would not have them, as we just don't have the financial income to cover everything."

Another woman writes, "Since I am self-employed, I cannot afford the expensive health plans, and since I am a diabetic, I should have medication, but I cannot afford medication because that is too expensive. I can't even afford the doctor because they are also too expensive. You have to see a doctor to get the medication. Hopefully there is an answer for me and people like me. I have a question: How can Canada sell the same medication for half the price? They must be doing something right."

One more story. "At age 64," age 64, remember this, just before Medicare, "at age 64 my wife is severely disabled by rheumatoid arthritis and is heavily reliant on at least 5 expensive prescription drugs. Over the past 3 years her total costs for those drugs has averaged just over \$7,500, of which I have paid just over \$2,000 out-of-pocket each year. I am fortunate to be able to cover that cost without sacrifice, but I am very concerned about what our situation will be when my wife turns 65, is forced to give up the private major medical policy which I now buy for her, and has to rely on Medicare and Medigap."

When she is over 65, she is on Medicare and she no longer has outpatient prescription drug coverage, and the Medigap policies that I mentioned earlier typically have caps of \$1,000, \$1,200, or, at most, \$1,500.

The truth is, the most profitable industry in the country is charging the highest prices in the world to people in this country who do not have health insurance that covers their prescription drugs. Twelve percent of the population is seniors. They buy 33 percent of prescription drugs. In my State of Maine, because there is no significant amount of managed care, I can tell you that just about 50 percent of the seniors in Maine have no coverage at all for their prescription medication, no coverage at all, and we know that over 80 percent of seniors take some prescription drugs, 83, 85 percent, something like that. So they are all taking prescription drugs.

In this context, what we have done on the Democratic side of the aisle is we have a plan, the President's plan for a Medicare prescription drug benefit, a start to help cover prescription medications for seniors who do not have the money to afford it right now.

We also have a bill that I have offered, and the gentlewoman has been a cosponsor from the beginning, which would provide a discount. If there are people who think a Medicare prescription drug benefit is too expensive for us now, we can do a discount, no new bureaucracy, no significant Federal expense, but a discount of up to 40 percent in the prices that seniors pay

today for their prescription medications.

The Republicans in this House will not adopt either proposal, will not bring either proposal to the floor. What we hear this week is they are about to bring a proposal forward that is great for the pharmaceutical industry, but it is a disaster for seniors, because it relies on private insurance.

I would ask my friends on the Republican side of the aisle, why is it so difficult to strengthen Medicare? Why is it so difficult to update Medicare and add a prescription drug benefit?

1900

The private sector plans that are out there have prescription drug benefits: Aetna, Signa, United. The major private health care plans around this country have prescription drug benefits. Why not Medicare? Is it that hard?

The answer is, it is not that hard. We could do it, and we could do it now. We could give relief to the seniors who have been writing me, who have been writing the gentlewoman, who have been talking to Democrats all across this country. It is a national scandal that we do not do something about it, and we must before we adjourn this fall.

I just want to say to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) how much I appreciate the gentlewoman's determination, her persistence, her leadership on this issue. She is really doing us all proud. I thank the gentlewoman very much.

Ms. STABENOW. I thank my colleague, who has been a terrific leader, really a pioneer, in this effort. He has been down here making the case.

As the gentleman says, there is more than one strategy. There is a discount by allowing pharmacies to purchase directly from the Federal price schedules. There is opening up the borders to allow people to bring drugs back in, or to do mail order.

Fundamentally what I believe is the long-term solution that we have to come to is taking the health care system for our seniors in the country today and modernizing it to cover the costs of medications. That is the way health care is provided today. We have an opportunity, a once-in-a-generation opportunity where we have choices we can make with a good economy.

In the long run, this saves money by making sure that we keep people healthy and out of the hospital, and allow them to be able to continue to live vigorous lives and be able to have their health care needs met. It makes no sense not to do it right. I want to thank the gentleman for joining me.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK), who has been a terrific leader in Northern Michigan, in the Upper Peninsula. He has been doing studies and meeting with people weekly to hear their concerns. I know the gentleman shares our concern and determination.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her leadership on this issue.

I was in my office doing some work and I heard the gentlewoman's statements, and statements the gentlewoman has received from around Michigan. She has been a leader around the Nation to try to get prices lower for all our constituents in Michigan. Some have been from Marquette Michigan, the area I represent.

I certainly share the gentlewoman's sentiments. In September of 1998, we had the Committee on Government Reform also do a study in my district, which as the gentlewoman said is the Upper Peninsula, Northern and lower Michigan.

We found that the most favored customers and the big HMOs, those who have insurance coverage, pay about half of what an uninsured senior would have to pay for prescription drug coverage. Not only is there inherent discrimination here, where we make those who can least afford it pay the most because they do not have the purchasing power behind them of a big HMO or a big insurance company.

What we have found also in further follow-up studies, and I know the gentlewoman has mentioned it tonight, in Mexico, Canada, the same drugs, the same companies, the same number of pills in that vial, and they pay 50 to 60 percent less.

Our seniors go to Canada up in our neck of the woods, or if they are in the South, they go to Mexico and get it for half the price.

I saw an article recently in Congress Daily where they said, Well, those countries do not allow us to put our true cost out there, and therefore, those countries have price controls over their prescription drugs. But in the United States, since we do not make any kind of controls or try to rein in these pharmaceutical companies, they charge basically whatever they want.

When we look at these studies, take the study from my district in 1998, they show the return on that investment on that prescription drug for those pharmaceutical companies, a 26.7 percent profit.

When inflation is 3 percent, their profit margin for that year, 1997, the most recent statistics we had, was 26.7 percent. For total profit after all the advertising, after all the research, it was \$28 billion.

I do not mind them making a profit, but I do not think in this time of low inflation we should have 26.7 percent profit or \$28 billion in profits and not help out those seniors who really need the help.

Take a look at it. I have a letter here from a lady from my district. I am going to be doing town halls for the next two weeks, and the gentlewoman will be also, in Michigan. We are going to hear a lot more about this.

She writes, "Dear sir, my only income is social security, a check of \$685. I live in a L'Anse housing apartment. I pay \$147 a month. I had to sell my car. I really do need the help." She sends

me her prescription drugs. There is \$54.39, \$50.51, \$15.53, \$12.74. These are monthly. Add that up.

Here is another one from another lady from L'Anse. She says, "Dear sir, I am enclosing receipts for medicine I had to take for pneumonia. My husband died December 11, 1998, and I have \$634 to live on for the month. I pay \$137.64 for Blue Cross insurance. I am 73½ years old and I still work, so I can continue with Blue Cross-Blue Shield and prescriptions. But even with the allowance, I still have to pay about \$20 for each prescription I take, and I do it for a month. So even though I have Blue Cross-Blue Shield, I still have to pay another \$80 in co-pay. I ask you, I don't have enough to go around. I sure hope something can be done on the price of prescription medicine."

Again, she made me copies from Primo Pharmacy of all of her pharmaceuticals.

Here is another individual from Cheboygan, Michigan. "In response to your AARP article concerning drug prices for seniors, I am 88 years old, a widow, living on a social security benefit of \$814 a month. I am enclosing receipts for my drugs for just 1 month, every month. Some months it is more. The total is \$446.36 a month. Seniors really need help with drug prices." She signs her letter.

The issue here is, seniors do need help with drug prices, with the costs of their drugs. There are three bills: the Allen bill from the gentleman from Maine, which takes the purchasing power of the Federal government to try to drive down the prices of prescription drugs for seniors who do not have any type of insurance coverage; the Stark bill, which actually says, make it part of Medicare, have universal service. There is the President's bill, which does a little bit of both.

I know the Republican party will be bringing forth a bill, and I look forward to it, but I hope they understand one thing. We have to stop the price discriminatory practices by the pharmaceutical companies and make it universal coverage. In this country, there is no reason why not.

In my district, about 40 percent of seniors do not have any prescription drug coverage. Why should they pay twice, twice as much as someone who happens to have a prescription drug coverage or is part of a large HMO?

As the gentlewoman knows, in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan there are no HMOs. In lower Michigan there is now one left. A very small part of my district can take advantage of an HMO to get prescription drug coverage.

Again, we do not mind them making a buck, but when their return is 26.7 percent, that is better than the market right now. Even after paying all the research, all the advertising, and whenever we open up the magazine it is full of advertising for this drug and that drug, they are still making \$28 billion a year. We do not mind a profit, but do not gouge our uninsured seniors to make a profit.

The Democrat party would like to see universal coverage, and stop the predatory price discriminatory practices of the pharmaceutical companies.

I must say, we have to thank the pharmacists throughout the State who have brought this to our attention and have helped us in these studies to show us what they have to pay. It is not their fault. The local pharmacist is doing the best they can. They get the price. If the customer is with Blue Cross/Blue Shield, they pay one price, with Aetna they pay a different price, with the Federal system they pay a different price. That is passed on from the pharmaceutical companies. The markup is very, very small, 1 or 2, 3 percent at most. These are the prices being set by the pharmaceutical companies.

I think in this day and age there is no reason why we cannot have prescription drug coverage for our seniors, especially those who, like these widows that I have brought these letters from, they have written to me, they did not have insurance policies. They did not have insurance plans. Their husbands are deceased. They live on social security. That is it.

No one would devise a Medicare plan nowadays without prescription drugs. Prescription drugs are wonderful. They save lives. We should have it. We should have it for everyone.

I want to thank the gentlewoman for her leadership. I look forward to working with her over the Easter break. I am sure we will be doing more town hall meetings. I am sure we will see more and more discussion about prescription drug coverage. But I thank the gentlewoman for having this special order tonight. It is an issue very near to the seniors in my district and throughout this country.

We reach out to our Republican friends. Together we can solve this problem. I hope that we will be joined by our friends across the aisle to put forth a program to just use the purchasing power of the Federal government under the Federal supply service, pass that on to those uninsured seniors, and we can cut the price in half for those seniors. That is not asking too much. I think we could do that. I hope they will join us with that.

Ms. STABENOW. I thank the gentleman very much for his efforts. I know this adds another dimension in our rural parts of the country in Michigan, up north in the UP, where it is more difficult to get to a hospital or other facilities as well. We need to really be strengthening our home health care and medications so people can be living at home and living with family, and having the opportunity to be independent. They have longer distances as well to drive, and it complicates health care provision, I know.

I want to thank the gentleman for all of his work. He is at the front end of what is happening, and I want to thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) for that.

Mr. Speaker, let me just stress again that we have within our means the

ability to solve this problem. Medicare was started in 1965 because half of our seniors could not find insurance or could not afford it. It has now become a great American success story of having a promise that every senior has some basic health care available to them once they reach age 65 or if they are disabled.

What we have today, though, is a false promise, because we cannot provide the kind of health care or access to the kind of health care that is practiced today. That is predominantly through our prescription drug strategies for providing health care. More and more of health care is provided through medications, and if the health care plan does not cover medications, people are in very tough shape.

Our goal is to modernize Medicare to cover the way health care is provided today. That is it. We are hoping that our colleagues will want to do that. My greatest fear is that there will be proposals put forward to subsidize the high cost, help seniors pay for the high prices, but not do anything to get a handle on the prices or bring some accountability to those prices.

We need to have somebody negotiating on behalf of seniors through Medicare to get the same kind of group discounts that people do if they go through a private insurance company or through an HMO. That is what can happen. The purchasing power of Medicare can make that happen, if we act this year. We have the ability to act, we have the resources to act, and we can do that on behalf of all of our seniors if we have the political will to make it happen. We did it with Y2K and we can do it with Medicare and prescription drugs for our seniors.

Mr. Speaker, I know the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) has been from northern Ohio, bordering right on Michigan, and we have a lot of ways in which we work together fighting for our seniors, for our families. She has also been a champion on this issue, as well.

I will just say in conclusion that we are going to keep going every week, every week, every week, until this gets fixed, because we can do no less for our seniors.

CONGRESS SHOULD NOT APPROVE PERMANENT NORMAL TRADE STATUS FOR THE PEOPLE'S RE- PUBLIC OF CHINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

IN SUPPORT OF PRESCRIPTION DRUG COVERAGE FOR SENIORS

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to thank my very able colleague, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW), for taking out this special order tonight on the important issue of prescription drugs. I would like to lend my verbal support and moral support to everything she is trying to do in

taking on this great leadership challenge for our Nation.

This past weekend I visited one of my dear friends back home who was denied coverage for prescription drugs, and was told that if he were to try to save his life in a cancer treatment, he and his wife would have to cough up \$1,500 a week. How would Members like to have to face that decision as they are trying to save their lives, and their family is surrounding them at one of the most difficult times it has ever faced?

So I am with the gentlewoman in her efforts here to do what is right for our senior citizens as well as our families. The people in the room in the hospital were from all ages, all the relatives. Here they had to contend with these insurance companies and all these prescription drug problems when they were trying to deal with a life and death situation.

I thank the gentlewoman from Michigan. We admire the gentlewoman's work and she has our support.

Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to advise my colleagues about one more reason that this Congress should not approve a blank check that will be before us in about 5 weeks called "Approving Permanent Normal Trade Status for the People's Republic of China."

I want Members to know, and I am placing in the RECORD the story of another one of my constituents from near Toledo, Ohio, in the village of White House. I hope the message I give tonight will reach the White House here in Washington.

1915

This is the story of Ciping Huang, a Chinese American at the University of Toledo, married to a gentleman from my community. She has been harassed, detained, interrogated, and expelled from China because of her association as a member of the Independent Federation of Chinese Students and Scholars in our Nation. She has been refused reentry into China to visit her ill father who is suffering from cancer, and I can think of no better example of the callous disregard for human rights exhibited daily by the government of the People's Republic of China than her story. I will read her letter to you, and I hope to bring her to Washington as this debate ensues.

She says, "Dear Congresswoman, my name is Ciping Huang and I am a council member of the Independent Federation of Chinese Students and Scholars in the United States."

She has been an elected officer in that organization, which was established in 1989, after the Tiananmen Square massacre.

"Unfortunately," she writes, "our involvement, our association's involvement, in democracy and freedom for China has resulted in harsh treatment by the Chinese Communist government, in particular on our student members as they try to return to their homeland. Whether a Chinese citizen or

an American citizen, our members can be harassed, detained, threatened or kicked out of China because of our activities. And what are our activities? Consistent delivery of overseas donations to the June 4 massacre victims and families from Tiananmen Square.

We support and have supported conditional yearly renewal of the most favored nation trade status for China, and because we lobby the United States Congress to provide protection for Chinese students and scholars from punishment by the Chinese Government due to their roles in fighting for democracy since 1989.

She says, "Take my story as an example. In 1998, while I went home to visit my aging parents in China, I was taken away by the secret police for interrogation on many details related to our student association and the activities of other Chinese Democratic groups and organizations.

For several days, they tried to force me to do things I did not want to do, including signing a confession letter. On the fifth day I was given 20 minutes to pack my luggage and say good-bye to my scared parents and was forced into Hong Kong. Still, the secret police told me they had treated me leniently because I am married to an American.

He had contacted his congressional representative, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), in order to protect me. The government told me I must cooperate with them afterwards and do what they wanted me to do if I ever wanted to return home to visit my parents again.

Last September, I learned my father had a 102 degree fever for several days and was diagnosed with cancer. I decided to take a trip back home immediately. However, about 20 police stopped me at the Shanghai International Airport. They searched my luggage and would not let me make phone calls or even go to the bathroom.

In the airport I asked them to respect the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which the Chinese President had just signed, and let me go visit my ill father, but my plea was simply ignored. I was put on the airplane back to Tokyo, even though they knew that the hospital had sent us a critical condition notice which stated that my father could die any minute.

In Tokyo, I repeatedly appealed to the Chinese authorities to allow me into China for basic humanitarian reasons but to no avail. Up until this day, I still have not been able to visit my poor father.

"For a long time," she says,

I have viewed America, its people and its government as the ones who hold the moral flags high who would be willing to help and sometimes sacrifice themselves for the people in the rest of the world to gain their basic human rights and dignity, and for humanitarian reasons.

Now for this permanent normal trade status, as well as admission to the WTO, the World Trade Organization, I wish you could prove that again. I wish you could answer this question correctly: Is business more important than the principles we live by? Do we care about the human rights condition of more than 1.2 billion human lives

In the past, the annual congressional conditional renewal of most favored nation to China was able to provide some leverage for Chinese human rights improvement, such as the release of some political prisoners and the relaxation of the political atmosphere within China. Unfortunately, as

you all know, without the attachment of the human rights improvement, conditions in China have deteriorated in the last few years.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to insert the remainder of this letter in the RECORD, and I will come to the floor again to read the conclusion.

The Chinese Communist government has not and will not learn democracy and respect human dignity from the PNTR. They would only take its passage as an advantage and signal that it is OK to continue their miserable, poor record on human rights and democracy.

But, if America could care less about people far away (look at what they have done to FaLun Gong members and Taiwan recently), I hope you do realize that the PNTR would do no more benefit for American workers, especially those in the trade Unions where people earn a living wage with health and retirement benefits. In China, there are no real workers unions; thus, it puts American workers in a much more disadvantaged position to compete with.

Let me stress, I wish that America will protect the human rights of its own people. Furthermore, America should help to protect the human rights of its own people by helping to protect the human rights of the people in the other countries. Only when these countries have human rights and democracy, shall the world be in peace. And I wish we could hold morality above money, but not the other way around. And I wish none of us, including our democratic government, would have to kneel in front of a dictatorial government for money, or mercy, or the human rights we deserve to have. And finally, with all of your conscience and help, I wish that in the near future, I would be able to visit my ill father in my homeland.

Thank you all.

Sincerely,

CIPING HUANG.

WHAT CAN BE DONE TODAY TO CHANGE THE CURRENT CLIMATE AS FAR AS PRESCRIPTION DRUGS FOR SENIORS IN THIS COUNTRY

THE SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. REYNOLDS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to address the American public and Members of the House tonight. I find myself in a minority in Washington, both among the Republicans and the Democrats. I am a practicing physician that normally practices and sees patients on Mondays and Fridays when I am not in Washington, and I see before us a situation much like a patient who would come to me with a fever, chills and night sweats, and the treatment we are about to give to that patient is to tell them to take an aspirin and cover up in a blanket and go home and they will get better, when the underlying problem is that they have pneumonia. Without totally diagnosing their disease, what I have done is committed inappropriate care and have actually harmed the patient.

If one is a senior citizen tonight, I want them to listen very carefully to

what I am going to explain to them about Medicare, and the tack that I am going to take is not necessarily going to be appreciated by most of the Members of this body.

I also happen to be a term-limited Member of Congress. I am not running for reelection, and I want to say that in my heart, knowing how severe the problems are for my patients with prescription drugs, the worst thing we can do for seniors is to add a costly prescription benefit drug to the Medicare program.

I am going to spend the next hour outlining why that is the case and why it ignores what the real problems are in the drug industry and the physician practices that now many of our seniors find themselves involved with.

I also want everyone to know that Medicare has been abused by the Members of this body, the other body and previous Presidents, because most workers in this country, as a matter of fact all workers in this country except if they are a Federal employee, are paying 1.45 cents out of every dollar they earn, no matter how much money they earn, into the Medicare part A trust fund.

As they pay that 1.45 cents, so does their employer. So that is almost 3 cents out of every dollar that is earned by every employee is paid into the Medicare part A trust fund.

The Congress, with the consent of the Presidents over the last 20 years, have stolen \$166 billion of that money. What they have done is they have put an IOU in there and said we will pay this back some day in the future, but they took that money and spent it on other programs. They did not say we need to raise taxes to do this good program. They did not say we are going to take the Medicare money and spend it on this program. They just very quietly took \$166 billion out of that trust fund for a hospital trust fund and spent it on other programs.

Now that is not a partisan statement. That is Republicans and Democrats alike.

So we now find that as of 2 weeks ago, that trust fund is going to be totally bankrupt by the year 2015.

Now we had some good news this last week. That has advanced to 2023; that is, if we do not do anything with Medicare.

We know that at least 17 cents out of every dollar that is paid out for Medicare is inappropriate. Where is the reform for Medicare? Where is the fix to the very program that is supposed to be supplying the needs of our seniors?

I see every day that I am in practice seniors who have a difficult time accomplishing what I want them to do as far as their drugs. I see seniors, and we have had described tonight, that have to make a choice between whether they are going to eat a meal or take a medicine. That is not all because there is not a prescription drug benefit because of Medicare, and what I want to outline is some of the deeper problems that are

associated with the pricing of drugs in this country, the overprescribing of drugs in this country, the lack of review of drugs that seniors are taking in this country, and what we can do about it to fix it before we ever start adding another program.

The reason that that is important, because if we add another benefit now the people who are going to pay for that is our grandchildren. It is not going to be 3 cents out of every dollar. It is going to be 9 cents out of every dollar, and what is really being said is the grandchildren's standard of living, if we establish a Medicare drug benefit, because that is who is going to pay for it because it is going to start in the year 2023 and there is going to be a significant price to pay, and that price is going to be manifested in the fact that their standard of living is going to be far less. They will not buy a new home because they are going to be paying 6 percent additional out of their income for a Medicare program.

What can we do today to change the current climate as far as prescription drugs in this country? I say there is a lot we can do. The first thing we can do is we can ask the President to instruct the FDA to get on the ball as far as generic drugs. The gentlewoman from Michigan mentioned that she had somebody write in and say she was taking Premarin. For 5 years there has been an application pending for an identical drug to Premarin that the vast majority of women over 50 years of age in this country are taking that will sell for one-sixth the cost that Premarin presently sells for.

Premarin sells for, a month, about \$30 average in this country. The same drug made in the same plant in Europe, not Canada and Mexico because they have price controls, in Europe sells for \$6.95. How is it that we are subsidizing the drug consumption of the rest of the world? There is something wrong with the market.

So it is not a nonconservative position to ask that competition be restored. The first thing we do is we get the FDA to approve more generic drugs.

I might also note that there was a recent release March 16 on four drug companies where the FTC found that two drug companies had paid two other drug companies to delay the release of their generics. In other words, they fixed prices. What that says to us is the Justice Department in this country ought to have an aggressive policy that is going to attack anticompetitive practices in the drug industry. If we do not fix that and we create a Medicare drug benefit, what we are going to do is waste money in Medicare, besides supplying the need for our seniors which is very real. I do not deny that.

If we do not fix that underlying pneumonia in this program and in the drug industry, all we are going to do is pay more money for it.

Those companies, and this can be found on the FTC Web site as of March

16, 2000, if anyone is interested in knowing, clear evidence that there is price fixing that is ongoing in the drug industry today; clear evidence that the Justice Department is not doing its job to make sure that there is competition among the drug industry.

The other thing that is important is 2 years ago, which I voted against and very few of us did, this Congress and this President passed FDA reform which allowed prescription drug companies to advertise prescription-only medicines on television. This year they will spend \$1.9 billion on television advertising for medicines that can only be gotten if a doctor writes a prescription for someone.

1930

Who is paying for that? We are paying for it. It is not necessarily more effective for the patient. It does not necessarily make us healthier. It just creates a brand name under which that drug company can sell more of a particular brand of drug without necessarily inuring any health benefit to us as a Nation. We ought to reverse that.

There is no reason to advertise prescription drugs on television. That is \$1.9 billion that would drop out of the price of drugs tomorrow. That is expected to go to \$5 billion next year. So we can take \$5 billion next year out of the cost of drugs.

This year, the average wholesale price of existing drugs in this country rose 12 percent. That is the year 1999. Not new drugs, drugs that were already out there. The costs associated to those drug companies for those was 1.8 percent. So they had a six-fold increase in price for existing drugs with a 1.8 percent increase in price.

That to me tells us that there is no competition in the drug industry. When the average cost of living was less, the increases all across the board were 3 percent, and prescription drugs, not new drugs, not new benefits, not things that were breakthroughs, increased four times the rate of inflation, we have to ask the question, what is going on in the drug industry?

Do not get me wrong. I believe in the free enterprise system. I believe in competition. I believe competition allocates scarce resources very effectively. But we do not have competition in the drug industry today.

A third thing that can happen is we ought to put a freeze, no additional mergers in the drug industry until there is a blue ribbon panel that says there is, in fact, competition to make sure that there is true competition.

A drug was recently introduced that competes with a drug that is on TV, everybody knows it as the purple pill. It is called Prilosec. A new drug, does the same thing slightly different, one would think they would want to get market share. One would think they would want to introduce that new drug at a price lower so that people might switch to that one to use it. Guess

what the average wholesale price? Exactly the same as Prilosec. Why is that? Because there is no competition in the drug industry.

Now, the statements I am making on the floor tonight will be met with hardball politics tomorrow by the drug industry, my colleagues can bet it. But unless America wakes up and does not go to sleep saying the problem to solve drugs for our seniors is to create a new program on a bankrupt program and charge it to our grandchildren, we will never solve the problems. The problems are severe.

There is another thing that could happen tomorrow that would help almost every person that has been mentioned in the hour before I started speaking. Almost every drug company in this country has an indigent drug program. They will give drugs free to indigent seniors, but it takes a little work. The doctor has to fill out something. It has to be mailed to the drug company. They will mail them a 30-day supply. One has to keep doing it if one wants them to keep getting it.

The drug companies are willing to do that, but the physicians in this country, because they are already overworked because of the overburdened system of managed care, do not really have the time to take advantage of that.

So here we have a benefit that would lower the cost, would make available drugs to many of our seniors, but it is not being utilized because of the mandated system and lack of competition and the lack of freedom associated with the health care system that we have.

There is still another thing that we could do, and this one my physician friends are not going to like. But we heard comments that a senior was on 17 medicines. Well, I will tell my colleagues any person in this country on 17 medicines is not feeling well. One of the reasons they are not feeling well is the medicines are making them not feel well.

Most good doctors were trained to do a medicine review at least every couple of months on somebody taking 17 medicines. One of the things that makes me happiest when I see seniors, they come to see me, and I look at the medicines they are on, if they are a new patient, the first thing I do is take them off three or four, and they think I am a hero. I am not a great doctor. It is just common sense that if one is on too many medicines, one is not going to feel good.

The second thing is, if one is on 17 medicines, one is not going to be taking them right. So they are not going to be effective.

The third thing is doctors have to pay attention to what medicines cost. Guess what? Most physicians are not doing that. They are writing a prescription. Our goal ought to be, as physicians, is if we are going to help somebody get well, we ought to make sure we can give them a prescription for a drug they can afford to take.

Now, that may not always be the best drug. It may be one that works 95 percent as well. But if they are taking the one that costs \$5 that works 95 percent as well compared to the one that costs four or five times as much and worked 99 percent instead of 95, which would one rather have one's mother and father on. I would rather have them on the one they are going to take.

So I think there are a lot of common sense things that ought to be approached before we ever start talking about sacrificing the future of our grandchildren by expanding a new Medicare program.

Now, let me give my colleagues a little history on Medicare. We talked about all the things. The closest the Federal Government, the best the Federal Government has ever done in estimating the cost of a new Medicare benefit they missed by 700 percent. So when my colleagues hear a new drug program is going to cost \$40 billion, it is going to cost \$280 billion at the least, \$280 billion.

Instead of this program being bankrupt in 2023, it is going to be bankrupt in 2007, 2008. Now, politically, if one is running for office, it does not take much courage to say one will vote for a Medicare benefit. But it takes a whole lot of courage to say, I do not think that is the best thing for all of us as a society as a whole.

Why do we not fix the real problems associated with the delivery of medicine and drugs and competition within the health care industry. By ignoring it, that patient I talked about that had pneumonia is going to die, and that is what is going to happen to Medicare. We will not let it die because the career politicians do not have the courage to challenge the system. It was last year that we finally got the Congress to stop touching Social Security money. But this year, if you will notice these charts, you can see how the Medicare money comes in. Medicare trust money comes in, it goes to the Federal Government. They use it, the excess money they put an IOU in there and the IOU is credited to the Medicare trust fund. Here is what is going to happen for the next 2 years.

These are not my numbers. These are Congressional Budget numbers as of 2 weeks ago. This year, the surplus in the Medicare part A trust fund is \$22 billion. The surplus in the fiscal year 2000, right now, as estimated by the CBO is \$23 billion. So \$22 billion of the \$23 billion that the politicians in Washington are going to call surplus is actually coming from Medicare trust fund.

Mr. Speaker, how about us not touching that? How about us not spending that on something else? How about us retiring outside debt, so that when it comes time for us to use that, we will have the money, that we will not have to go borrow it from our children and grandchildren.

Year 2001, the same thing, \$22 billion of the surplus which is projected right now at \$22 billion, it is all Medicare

part A money. So we can claim we have a surplus, but we have to wink and nod at you and say, well, it really is part A trust fund money, but we are going to borrow it, because we cannot control the appetite of the Federal bureaucracies. We cannot make them efficient to do what they need to do it, and we cannot meet the needs of the commitments that we have made to the rest of America by making sure government is at least as efficient as the private sector, what we are going to do is we are going to steal the money.

Instead of \$166 billion that we owe, we are going to go to \$189 billion this year, and then we are going to go to \$211 billion next year. And then pretty soon, it is going to tail right back off, because as we add a drug program, the numbers are going to be uncontrollable.

So we have major problems ahead of us, and they are confused because the only thing that the people in Washington want to talk about is answering the easy political problem. A senior has problem buying drugs, so, therefore, we create a Federal program that buys drugs. That is not the answer that our children deserve. That is not the answer that you deserve when you elect people to come up here.

We need to make the hard choices, even if it means we do not get re-elected, we need to make the hard choices to fix the programs so they work effectively.

I notice a friend of mine has shown up, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT), and I would welcome him and recognize him now and yield to him.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) for yielding and for this special order and I thank our colleagues earlier for talking about this problem, because it is a major problem. And, unfortunately, for both the administration and some of the leadership here in Congress, what we are talking about is solving what some people say is the problem, and that is that seniors are not getting the prescription drugs or a benefit that some people feel they should, when the real problem is runaway prices, and as the gentleman indicated earlier, a tendency to overprescribe.

Mr. Speaker, I am not certain what we can do in terms of influencing the medical professionals as it relates to overprescribing, but I think we need to take an honest and sober look at how much Americans pay for prescription drugs relative to the rest of the world. Now, I do not believe in price controls. I believe in markets. I believe at the end of the day that markets are more powerful than armies.

Last Saturday night, I was privileged to attend a dinner and the last leader of the Soviet Union, Mikhail Gorbachev, spoke to us; and it was interesting, because as he talked for an hour and 12 minutes, he went through sort of his metamorphosis and where he fi-

nally came to the acknowledgment that they could not compete with the United States, that a market economy was much more efficient than a controlled government-run economy.

He finally reached the point where he realized that both militarily, economically, and, perhaps, even socially and culturally, that the West had won, and they had to do something else. I believe in markets.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the idea of having a big government bureaucracy trying to control prices and make certain that everybody gets the right drugs, I think that is ridiculous; and frankly, if anything, here in Washington, we ought to be restricting the power of the Health Care Finance Agency and of the FDA.

Let me just run through this. There is a group, I believe they are out of Utah. I owe them a big debt of gratitude William Faloan has put out a brochure, and this is available to any Member or anyone else who wants to call my office, we will send them out a copy of this. They have done an interesting study on the differences between prescription drug prices here and in Europe.

We have a tendency to still think of Europe as being sort of our adolescent child. After World War II, the United States basically made certain that the European economy was rebuilt, but today the European Union has a bigger economy, in terms of gross domestic product, than we do. It is interesting in respects, we continue to subsidize what is happening in Europe, whether it is militarily and even in drugs.

Let me just run through a few of these drugs. And frankly the gentleman probably knows better than I do what these drugs are prescribed for, but these are some of the most commonly prescribed drugs in the world. One the gentleman mentioned earlier is Premarin. The average price in the United States, according to a study done by the Life Extension Foundation, Mr. Faloan's organization, the average price in the United States last year was \$14.98 for a 28-day supply. The average price in Europe is \$4.25.

Mr. COBURN. For one third of the price?

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Less than a third of the price.

Mr. COBURN. The same drug?

Mr. GUTKNECHT. The same drug made by the same company in the same plant under the same FDA approval.

Mr. Speaker, let me run through a few more. Synthroid, now that is a drug that my wife takes. In the United States, the average price for a 50-tablet supply of 100 milligrams, the average price in the United States \$13.84. In Europe, it is \$2.95. Cumadin, that is a drug that my dad takes. He has a heart condition. It is a blood thinner I understand. Cumadin, 25 capsules, 10 milligrams, the average price in the United States \$30.25; the average price in Europe \$2.85.

Let us take Claritin, which is a commonly prescribed drug in America today, and they advertise quite heavily, as the gentleman indicated earlier, the average price in the United States for a 20-tablet supply of 10 milligrams is \$44. In Europe that same drug made in the same plant by the same company, same dose everything is \$8.75.

Augmentin, and I do not know what Augmentin is for perhaps the gentleman does.

Mr. COBURN. Augmentin is a very effective antibiotic.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. For Augmentin, a 12-tablet supply of 500 milligram here in the United States we pay an average of \$49.50. In Europe, for exactly the same drug, the price is \$8.75.

1945

Glucophage. Perhaps the gentleman can share with us what this is.

Mr. COBURN. That is an anti-diabetic drug.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Apparently it is commonly prescribed; 850 milligram capsules, quantity of 50. The average price in the United States is \$54.49. The average price in Europe is \$4.50.

And this is a group in Minnesota that has done this study. Another commonly prescribed drug, Prilosec, the average price here in the United States is around \$100 for a 30-day supply. That same 30-day supply, if a person happened to be vacationing in Winnipeg, Manitoba, and they take their prescription into a drugstore there, they will pay \$50.80 for the drug that sells in the United States for roughly a hundred dollars.

But here is what is even more troubling. I will use that term. What is more troubling is that if we were to buy that same drug, same company, same FDA approval, but we purchase it in Guadalajara, Mexico, that same drug sells for \$17.50.

Now, I do not believe in price controls. I do not believe we should have a new agency to try to control drug prices. I believe that markets are more powerful than armies. But let me just say this. A few years ago this Congress passed the North American Free Trade Agreement; and we allow corn, we allow beans, we allow lumber, we allow cars, we allow steel, and we allow all kinds of goods to go back and forth across the border between the United States and Canada and between the United States and Mexico. That is what free trade is all about. But there is one exception. We do not allow prescription drugs to go across those borders.

And, really, to give an analogy, and it is the best analogy that I have come up with, let us just say that there are three drugstores. One is on the north side of town, one is on the south side of town, and one is downtown. Now, there is over a 50 percent difference in the prices that those three stores charge, but our own FDA, our own Federal Government, the Food and Drug Administration, says, Oh, you American

consumers can only buy your drugs from the most expensive store.

Now, I asked a businessperson this morning. I said, Suppose you are in a business, and you find out that you are the largest customer of a particular supplier, and yet you also find out that they are selling exactly the same thing to some of your friends that are in the business cheaper than they are selling to you, even though you are their biggest customer. How long do my colleagues think that would last? But that is exactly what is happening in the drug industry.

The FDA, and I believe really without any legislative approval, has decided that they will unilaterally stop the importation of drugs into the United States which are otherwise approved in the United States. And to me that is outrageous. We should not stand idly by as a Congress and allow our own FDA to stand between American consumers in general and American seniors in particular. We should not allow our own FDA to stand between them and lower drug prices.

And the one great thing about markets, whether we are talking about oil or we are talking cotton or we are talking about prescription drugs, I do not care what it is, the great thing about markets is they have a way of leveling themselves.

In southeastern Oklahoma, I will bet that if the gentleman goes to any of the elevators in his district, he will find that the elevator in Enid—well, Enid is not in the gentleman's district. I am trying to think of one of the towns. I have been to virtually every town in the gentleman's district. But if the gentleman were to go to one town in southern Oklahoma, the wheat price might be X amount today. And if the gentleman called over to another elevator, it might be a different price. The chances are the prices would be different.

But over time, what would happen? Those prices would tend to self-regulate. Because the farmers start figuring out that if the elevator in Enid, Oklahoma, is paying a higher price than the one in Muskogee, they will all start going to Muskogee. And what happens is the prices start to level. That is the way markets work. The unfortunate thing is that our Federal Government has been standing in the way of allowing those markets to work.

And so, again, I would say that Members who would like a copy of this brochure, and I must say that I had nothing to do with writing this, but this brochure, put out by the Life Extension Foundation, is a reprint of their February Year 2000 brochure, which tells the whole story. It gives an excellent chart of how much more American consumers are paying.

Now, again, I do not want price controls. But this is what I say to my seniors: we should not have "stupid" tattooed across our foreheads. It is outrageous that Americans are paying upwards of 40 percent more than the rest

of the world for prescription drugs, and it seems to me that we have a moral obligation, particularly now that we are having this discussion about opening up, in effect, perhaps a new entitlement, if we do that without dealing with the real problem, which is runaway prices, then I say, shame on us.

I yield back to my colleague from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Well, I thank the gentleman for making the point on competition, and I think that is the question I would ask of the seniors and those that are out there working today and those that are going to be working tomorrow. Would it not make sense to try to fix competition within the industry, improve the quality of our health care and increase the efficiency and accuracy of the system before we go solve the problem?

The question is can we make sure our seniors have available to them the drugs that they need, that will give them effective treatment, and can we do that in a compassionate way so that they are not passing up supper to take a pill or they are not missing a pill to get supper? Can we do that without creating a big government program?

I can tell my colleague that I believe we can. It will not be easy, because we will have to attack our friends. We are going to have to say there is not good competition. We are going to have to go back in and make sure that the branches of government that are involved in assuring competition in the drug industry are there.

That is not to say that the drug companies do not do a wonderful job in their research. And it is not to say that they are not going to be doing an even better job as we have all these genetically engineered drugs that will come about in the next 10 years. But we hear the drug companies say that they will not be able to do this because all these prices are based on the fact that we spend all this money on R&D. Well, the fact is the pharmaceutical industry spends more money on advertising than they do on research. They have a cogent argument as soon as that number on advertising drops significantly below the amount of money that they are spending on research. Until then, they do not have an argument that holds any water.

So our seniors out there tonight that are having trouble getting prescription drugs and affording it, the first thing they need to do is to ask their doctor to make an application for them for the indigent drug program that almost every drug company has. That way they can at least have the drugs.

Number two, they should ask their doctor if in fact there is not a generic drug that could be used that will be almost as effective and that will save a significant amount of money each year.

Number three, they should ask the doctor if he or she is sure that every medicine they are taking they have to be taking. That way we can make sure

that the patients are getting medicines that they need today; that the medicines that they are taking are as effective and cost effective as well, and that they truly need them.

That takes care of part of the demand. The other thing they can do is insist that their representatives ask the Justice Department to look aggressively at collusion and anti-competitive practices within the drug industry. They should ask their elected representative to reverse the bill 2 years ago that allowed drug companies to advertise prescription drugs on television. Because we could save at least \$2 billion this year, \$5 billion next year in terms of the cost of drugs.

Finally, they should ask that their representative not steal one penny from Medicare this year to run the Government. And if in fact we do those things, we can meet the needs of our seniors, we can preserve Medicare and extend its life, and we can assure that our children and our grandchildren are not going to be burdened with another program that is inefficient, underestimated in cost, and really does not solve the underlying problem associated with prescription drugs for our seniors.

I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota for any additional comments.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Well, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

I would only say that I think what the gentleman is really saying is, and this is really an interesting debate, that at the end of the day it is about fundamental fairness. It is, from a generational perspective, wrong for us to borrow from the next generation.

But it is also wrong for the drug companies to require Americans to pay the lion's share of all the research and development cost as well as footing most of the cost for their profit. And the dirty little secret is that that is what is happening in the world today. We have a world market, but the drug companies have realized that they can get most of their profit, most of their research and development money, from the American market.

Now, I think Americans should pay their fair share of research cost. I think that is important. I agree with the gentleman that I am not certain Americans should have to pay advertising costs. Ultimately, it really should be the decision of the doctor more than being market driven and having almost a pulling effect through the marketplace by advertising, by broadcasting on television, radio, and so forth. I am sure that that is an issue that we need to address.

But I want to come back to just how much more we pay. It is not just us saying this. This is a study done by the Canadian Government. If people forget everything that I have said tonight, remember a couple of numbers. One of the most important numbers is 56. By their own study, the Canadian government says that Americans pay 56 percent more for their prescription drugs than Canadians do.

Now, 56 is important, too, because over the last 4 years prescription drugs in the United States have gone up 56 percent, 16 percent just in the last year. One of the biggest driving costs in terms of the cost of insurance over the last several years has been the increasing cost of prescription drugs.

Now, again, that is important. We need prescription drugs. We need to make certain that we are doing what we can so that the next generation of drugs can come online. I believe in research, and I believe part of the reason we enjoy the high standard of living that we do in America today is because of the research that has been done in the past. So we do not want to cut that. We do not want to create a new bureaucracy. But we also do not want to steal from our kids, and we do not want to "solve this problem" by creating a whole new entitlement.

Here is another fact. Last year, according to the Congressional Budget Office, we, the American people, we the taxpayers, the Federal Government, spent over \$15 billion on prescription drugs. Now, that is through Medicare, Medicaid, the VA, and other Federal agencies.

Mr. COBURN. Let me clarify that for a minute, because I want to be sure all our colleagues understand that. That is Federal payments for prescription drugs.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Just Federal payments. Now, there is a match with Medicaid, there is a match with some of the other programs, and of course in some of those cases the individuals themselves had some kind of a copayment. But that is what the Federal Government spent for prescription drugs last year, according to the Congressional Budget Office.

Now, virtually every study I have seen, independent studies, say that Americans are paying at least 40 percent more than the world market price for those drugs. Now, I am not good at math, and I demonstrated that this morning; But let us say 30 percent. Let us say we are already getting some discounts. And I suspect we are. I do not think we are paying full retail at the Federal level for our prescription drugs. So let us say we are getting some discounts. But let us just say we could bring our prices somewhere near the world average price for these same drugs. If we could save 30 percent times \$15 billion, that is over \$4 billion.

That would go a long ways to solving our problem, to making certain that people on Medicare all have the opportunity to get the drugs that they need and, again, that they do not have to make the choice that the gentleman talked about earlier. They do not have to choose between eating supper on Friday or taking the drugs they need, not only to preserve their health but to preserve their quality of life. Because drugs are important in that regard. It is not just about extending our life, it is about improving the quality of our life.

And drugs are wonderful things. And I certainly do not want to take anything away from the pharmaceutical companies. But as I say, I do not think we should be required to pay more than our fair share of the cost of developing those drugs, of making those drugs, of getting those drugs approved, and then plowing more money back into the next generation.

So I think we are on the same page. I just want to finally say this. This is a matter of basic fairness. As I said earlier, I do not think we should allow our own FDA to stand between American consumers and more reasonable drug prices, because that is what is happening today.

Finally, not hearing most of the discussion from our friends that spoke before us, this is not a debate between the right versus the left. It is not even a debate between Republicans versus Democrats. This is really a debate about right versus wrong. And it is simply wrong for us to shovel billions of more dollars into an industry who right now is charging Americans billions of dollars more than they would normally pay in terms of a world market price.

2000

The answer is not to steal more from our kids to give more money to the big pharmaceutical companies. The answer is coming up with a market-based system that allows some kind of competitive forces to control the price of the drugs and therein creating the kinds of savings which will make it much easier for us and for those seniors to get the drugs that they need.

And so, my colleague is absolutely right, this is not an unsolvable problem. If we will work together, if we will listen to each other, if we will be willing to tackle some of those tough problems, and if we are willing to take on some of the entrenched bureaucracies, whether it is at the FDA or the large pharmaceutical company, the Department of Justice, and even some of our friends in the medical practice, if we are willing to ask the tough questions, force them to have to work with us to find those answers, this is a very solvable problem.

I just hope we do not make the mistake of creating a new expensive bureaucracy, a new expensive entitlement and, at the very time we ought to be doing more to control the prices of prescription drugs, have the net practical effects of driving them even higher. That would be a terrible mistake not just for this generation but for the next, as well.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

In closing, the next time my colleagues hear a politician from Washington talk about prescription drugs, ask themselves why they are not treating the pneumonia that this industry has, ask themselves why they are not saying there needs to be competition in drugs, ask themselves why they are not

saying the FDA needs to be approving more generics, ask themselves why they are not speaking about the underlying problems associated with delivery of health care and medicines to our seniors instead of creating a new program which our children will pay for but, most importantly, will be twice as expensive as what it should be because we have not fixed the underlying problems.

I want to leave my colleagues with one last story. I recently had one of my senior patients who had a stroke. She was very fortunate in that she had no residuals. But the studies of her carotid arteries proved that she had to be on a medicine to keep her blood from clotting.

One of my consulting doctors wanted to put her on a medicine called Plavix. It is a great drug. It is a very effective drug. The only problem is it costs over \$200 a month. The alternative drug that does just as well but has a few more risks, which she had taken before in the past, is Coumadin.

Now, the difference in cost per month is 15-fold. I could have very easily written her a prescription for Plavix. She would have walked out of the hospital, not been able to afford the Plavix, and had another stroke, or I could have done the hard work and said, this is going to do 95 percent of it. It is going to be beneficial. It has a few risks. Here is what this costs. What do you think? She chose to take the Coumadin because that gives her some ability to have some control of her life.

So these are complex problems; and I do not mean to oversimplify them, and I do not mean to derange either the physicians, the patients, or the drug companies, other than to say that our whole economy is based on a competitive model and, when there is no competition, there is price gouging.

Today I honestly believe in the drug industry there is price gouging. We need to fix it, and we need to fix that before we design any Medicare benefit to supply seniors with drugs, especially since there are free programs out there that are not being utilized that are offered by the drug companies.

DIFFERENCES IN APPLICABILITY OF WATER USAGE IN WEST AS COMPARED TO EAST

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALDEN of Oregon).

Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, this evening in my night-side chat I would like to take the opportunity really to talk about three subjects.

The first subject is the subject that is very important to all of us, obviously. It is the only way that we can survive. But in the West there is a lot of differences on the applicability of it as compared to the East. And that is water.

The second issue that I would like to talk about tonight is also a doctrine that has particular specifics in regards to the West. It is called the Doctrine of Multiple Use.

The third subject I hope I get an opportunity this evening to talk about is on the issue of education.

Mr. Speaker, it seems, as my colleagues know, last evening I spoke about education. I spoke about discipline in the classroom. I spoke about the fact that we need to assist our teachers out there by having some consequences of misbehavior in the classroom. And apparently I hit a soft spot with some people because I heard from some people overnight say, how dare you talk about discipline in the classroom.

I could not believe it. Some of these people were very antagonistic. I am pleased to say I did not get many letters out of the West. I got them out of the East. And I am sure I got them, in my opinion, from some pretty liberal people that, for some reason, think that we should follow political correctness when we talk about classroom discipline, that, for some reason, classroom discipline really is not a problem in today's school system. So I hope I have an opportunity to come back to that subject because it is something I believe very firmly in.

Education is so fundamental for the survivability of this country. It is so fundamental for our country to remain the superpower in this world that we have to give it all of the attention that we can give to it. But it also means that we have got to be ready to face the music. And when we have problems with discipline in our school system, sometimes we cannot be politically correct. Sometimes we have got to go right directly to the problem. I hope we have an opportunity to talk about that.

But let us talk and begin, first of all, by talking about water. Water in the West is very critical. One of the concerns I have is here in the East. In fact, when I came to the East for the first time, I was amazed at the amount of rain that we get in the East. In the West, we are in a very arid region, and we do not have that kind of rainfall. It does not rain in the western United States like it rains in the eastern United States. As a result of that, we have different problems that we deal with in regards to water.

My district is the Third Congressional District of Colorado, as my colleagues know. It is a mountain district. The district actually geographically is larger than the State of Florida. And if any of my colleagues here have ever skied in Colorado, if they have ever gone into the 14,000-foot mountains, with the exception of Pike's Peak, they are in my district in Colorado.

Water is very critical, as it is everywhere else. But we are going to talk about some of the different aspects of water, about the spring runoff, about water storage, about water law in gen-

eral, about how we came about to preserve and to store our water through water storage projects.

But let us begin I think with an appropriate quote from a gentleman named Thomas Hornsberry Ferrell. He said, speaking about Colorado, "Here is a land where life is written in water. The West is where water was and is father and son of an old mother and daughter following rivers up immensities of range and desert, thirsting the sundown, ever crossing the hill to climb still drier, naming tonight a city by some river a different name from last night's camping fire. Look to the green within the mountain cup. Look to the prairie parched for water. Look to the sun that pulls the oceans up. Look to the cloud that gives the oceans back. Look to your heart, and may your wisdom grow to the power of lightning and the peace of snow."

Let us say a few basic facts so that we understand really some fundamental things about water. First of all, I have got a chart and I know it is somewhat small, but I hope that my colleagues are able to see it. Let me go through it. It talks about water usage. It is very interesting, very few people realize how much water it takes for life to exist, how much water it takes to feed a person three meals a day, how much water it takes to feed a city, for example, their drinking water or their cleaning water or their water for industrial purposes. But this chart kind of gives us an idea.

The chart is called "water usage." I would direct the attention of my colleagues to my left to the chart. Americans are fortunate, we can turn on the faucet and get all the clean, fresh water we need. Many of us take water for granted.

Have my colleagues ever wondered how much water we use every day? This is direct usage of water on a daily basis, our drinking and our cooking water. Now, this is per person. Our drinking and our cooking water, two gallons of water a day. Flushing of our toilets on a daily basis, five to seven gallons per flush. That is on an average. We now have some toilets that have reduced that usage somewhat. Washing machines, 20 gallons per load. Now, remember, this is daily. Twenty gallons per load. Dishwasher, 25 gallons every time we turn on that dishwasher. Taking a shower, 7.9 gallons per minute. In essence, eight gallons every minute a person is in the shower. Eight gallons of water.

Now, growing foods takes the most consumption of water. As I said earlier, water is the only natural resource that is renewable. But in our foods, growing foods, the actual agriculture out there is the largest consumer of water in the Nation. And here is why growing foods takes the most water.

One loaf of bread takes 150 gallons of water. From the time they till the field, to watering the field, to harvest the wheat, to take care of the industrial production of the bread, to actually have the bread mix made and have

it delivered, 150 gallons of water for one loaf of bread.

One egg. To produce one egg through the agriculture market, it takes 120 gallons of water. One quart of milk, 223 gallons of water. One pound of tomatoes. One pound of tomatoes takes 125 gallons of water. One pound of oranges, 47 gallons of water. One pound of potatoes, 23 gallons of water. Those are pretty startling statistics.

We go down a little further. Did my colleagues know it takes more than a thousand gallons of water a day to produce three balanced meals for one person? So, in one day, for one person to have three balanced meals, when we total up all the water necessary to provide for that, it is a thousand gallons of water a day.

What happens to 50 glasses of water? On the chart here on my left that I direct my colleagues to, we have 50 glasses of water. Forty-four glasses of water are used for agriculture. Two glasses are used by the cities for domestic water. And a half a glass is used for rural housing. But we can see, out of the 50, 44 glasses of water are used just for agriculture.

Now, there is some very interesting things about water in the world. Keep in mind these statistics. Ninety-seven percent of the water supply in this world is salt water. And today's technology, although we have a very expensive process for desalinization of plants, essentially, we really do not have an economical process to take salt water and convert it to drinking water. Ninety-seven percent of the water in the world today is salt water. Of the remaining three percent, we have three percent left, 75 percent of that remaining three percent is water tied up in the ice caps. Of all the water we have, only .05 percent of that water is in our streams and in our lakes. So it gives us an idea of the challenge that we face.

Now, in the United States, when we take a look at what is the lay of the water, we find that 73 percent of the stream flow in the United States is claimed by States east of the line drawn north to southeast of Kansas.

2015

So 73 percent of the water in the United States lies in this part of the Nation. Now, when we take a look at the Pacific Northwest, in the Pacific Northwest there is about 12 percent of the water. Over here we have 73 percent of the water essentially in the East. Up in the Pacific Northwest, we have about 12, 13 percent of the water. The balance of the water which is about 14 percent, is water that is shared by 14 States in the West. This is the arid region of the United States, those 14 States. They include States like Colorado, Wyoming, New Mexico, Utah, Arizona, Colorado, Nevada. Those are the dry States in our country.

Now, Colorado is the highest State in the Nation. In fact, the Third Congressional District which I represent in

Colorado is the highest congressional district in the Nation. So as a result of that, we have a lot of variance over, say, a lower elevation. For example, our evaporation. We have about an 85 percent factor of evaporation at that kind of altitude; and we have a lot of water, as Members know. We have a lot of snow that comes down, but we have to deal with evaporation at a very high percentage.

When we talk about Colorado, what I am going to do instead of talking about all of the States of the West, I thought I would focus specifically, obviously, on the area I know the best, and that is Colorado. Let us talk about the characteristics of Colorado and the different problems and issues that we deal with water in Colorado.

On average in Colorado, we get about 16, 16½ inches of water every year. We do not have much rainfall. If Members have been out to the mountains of Colorado, which as I said earlier is the district that I represent, they know that in the springtime and throughout the summer we have rains, but those rains are very brief. Our typical rainstorm comes in, lasts 20 minutes, and it goes away, comes back the next day and generally in the mountains.

Out in the plains we may not see it for a long time. We do not have heavy rains as you do here in the East. But we have a lot of variances. For example, in my particular district, in the region of the mountains, we have 80 percent of the water. Eighty percent of the population in Colorado lives outside those mountains, in cities like Denver and Colorado Springs and Fort Collins and Pueblo. Now, in Colorado because we do not have much rainfall, we depend very heavily on the snows during the wintertime and for a period of about 60 to 90 days called the spring runoff when the snow melts off our highest peaks and comes down, for that period of time we have all the water we can handle. But after that period of time in Colorado, if we do not have the capability to store our water, to dam our water, we lose the opportunity to utilize that water.

Now, the rivers and streams throughout this Nation have a lot of history to them. When we take a look at the frontiersmen that went out into the West, for example, to settle the West, remember the old saying, go West, young man, go West. When we take a look at it through these wilderness areas, and everything was wilderness in the West, really your path, your highway through the wilderness were the rivers and the streams. It is where life really centered around, the communities were built around it, the trappers. The trappers trapped by the rivers and the streams. Even the miners and the minerals when they discovered minerals in the Rocky Mountains of Colorado, for example, it centered around streams. That is why when you go through Colorado, most of your communities are built there near the streams.

But what is unique about Colorado is we are the only State in the union

where all of our free-flowing water goes out of the State. Colorado is the only State in the union that has no free-flowing water coming into the State that we are able to utilize. So as you can guess, as they say, water runs thicker than blood in Colorado and that applies to the other mountain States and the West in general.

Now, Colorado is called the mother of rivers. Why? Because we have four major rivers that have their headwaters in the State of Colorado. We have the Colorado River, and I will come back to the Colorado River in a moment. We have the South Platte River, and the South Platte River drains the most populous section of the State and serves the area with the greatest concentration of irrigated agricultural lands in Colorado. That is the South Platte.

We have the Arkansas River. That begins up near Ledville, Colorado. It flows south and then east through southern Colorado and then down towards the Kansas border. We also have the Rio Grande River. That Rio Grande drainage basin is located in south central Colorado. It is comparatively small compared to the other rivers and has less than 10 percent of the State's land area in it.

Let us talk about the Colorado River. That is a very important river for the entire Nation. Twenty-five million people get their drinking water out of the Colorado River. The Colorado River drains over one-third of the State's area. And although only about 20 percent of the Colorado River basin exists in the State of Colorado, the State of Colorado puts about 75 percent of the water into that basin.

The Colorado River provides a lot of things besides water. It provides clean hydropower, for example. Just out of the Colorado River alone, we irrigate over 2 million acres of agricultural land throughout that river basin. Now, the river is very unique. As Members know as I described earlier in the West, everybody is trying to grab for water. And so as a result of that, there are a lot of what we call "compacts." They are in essence treaties, how do we agree how the water is going to be shared.

And, of course, we also have to remember there are some basic things about water. Remember I said earlier that water is the only natural resource that renews itself. In other words, what logically follows is one person's water waste could be another person's water. For example, some people have said in Colorado, why don't you go and line your ditches, let's put concrete on the bottom of your ditches and therefore you avoid seepage; the water doesn't seep out of the ditch. Well, you have to be careful about that because that water seepage may be the very water that provides water for the spring or the well or the aquifer many, many miles away.

Someday technologically, I hope in our lifetime, we will be able to pull up

on a computer screen the map, the water map as, for example, in the State of Colorado where all of those little fingers of water, where they all begin, where they all move, how they move, at what speed they move, and what kind of cleansing process they go through. It is very interesting if you really want to get into it.

But water on its face is a pretty tough product to sell an interest in. Why? I do not mean property interest. I mean, people do not worry much about water as long as they turn on the faucet and the water is there, number one, and, number two, the water is clean. Therefore, it is an obligation of the leaders of our country, leaders such as you and myself, it is our obligation to assure that we have quantity of water and that we have clean water for the future.

Let us go back to the Colorado River basin for a moment. The Colorado River basin really has compacts on it, and because the Colorado River goes down throughout and actually ends up in the Gulf of Mexico, the Colorado River really goes to Mexico, ends up in the Gulf of Mexico, we have several compacts. The major compact, the Colorado River compact, is between the upper basin States and the lower basin States. The upper basin States, for example, would be Colorado, Utah, New Mexico. Lower basin States would be like Arizona, California, Nevada. And we have an agreement on the Colorado River on this Colorado River compact which says that the upper basin States and the lower basin States are each entitled to 7½ million acre/feet per year. An acre/foot is enough to feed a family of four. It would be about a foot of water over a football field, enough water that should feed a family of four for a year. 7½ million acre/feet per year is how that is divided.

I am going to get into a little more about that, but first of all let us talk a little about Colorado water law. I am just going to summarize and give some very basics to it, Mr. Speaker, because the law here in the East is really based on the riparian doctrine. Our doctrine is based on what is called the Colorado doctrine in the State of Colorado. The history of the doctrine came about in the California gold rush days, when all of a sudden we had a lot of settlers going out to the mountains about 1849. And because the water in Colorado, because of the aridness of the Colorado, we came up with the doctrine that no matter how far away you are from the river, our doctrine is first in use, first in rights. So the first one to go to the river and use the water, no matter how far away they live from the river, if they are first to use it, they get first right. If they are second to use it, they fall in priority to second place; if they are third to use it, they fall in priority to third place. That is basically known as the doctrine of prior appropriation.

Now, as I said, the eastern States primarily follow the riparian doctrine. Now, the Colorado constitution, in ad-

dition to having the doctrine of prior appropriation, also recognizes uses in priority. The highest priority or the preference of water use with the highest priority in Colorado is domestic use for your home, the second use is agricultural use in priority, and the third use is industrial use.

In Colorado, we also have a unique situation. We are pretty proud of this because we are very conscious of the environment out there. Obviously, if you have been out to the district, you have been out to Colorado, you have a deep appreciation of why we are proud of our environment out there, what we have to protect out there. One of the things that we have discovered throughout the years is there is a lot of damage to an environment if you run the creek dry. So what we have done in Colorado is we have appropriated in-stream rights, minimum stream flows over thousands of miles of stream beds so that we guarantee that a minimum amount of water will remain in those streams so that we can mitigate and minimize the environmental impact.

Now, clearly we are always going to have some impact. If you are going to take water out and drink it, you are going to have less water in the stream or in the creek. So you are going to have an impact. We have to have a balance there. We think in Colorado we reach a pretty good balance. Now, clearly we have some people that object to that. We have some people, especially located in the East, things like Ancient Forests and some of the Earth First and some of those type of people, the National Sierra Club, those people that want all of our dams taken down.

In fact, the National Sierra Club, their number one priority is to take down Lake Powell. Lake Powell has more shoreline than the entire Pacific West Coast. Lake Powell is a major power producer, hydropower, clean power. Lake Powell is the major flood control dam we have in the West. Lake Powell is the main family recreational area for many States around it. Now, the only people that would want to take down Lake Powell are people that do not have, in my opinion, a lot of, one, appreciation for the uniqueness of the West and the needs of the West; two, do not have a lot of appreciation for human needs; and, three, frankly maybe they do not care about the needs of the West.

But let us go back to our subject here at hand. We have given a brief outline of the prior appropriation. Now, let us talk about water storage. As I mentioned to you earlier, we just talked a little about Lake Powell, but water storage is critical for us in the West. We have to have these dams. The Federal Government recognized this many years ago. Great governmental leaders like Wayne Aspinall, a Congressman from the State of Colorado, helped authorize these projects. And we had support frankly from Congresspeople, colleagues of ours that preceded us, col-

leagues from the East, colleagues from across the Nation that recognized that out in the West we had to have water storage.

I hope that many of my colleagues, while tonight you may not be particularly interested in Western water problems, I hope that tonight's comments give you an opportunity that when some questions arise, for example, about Lake Powell or water storage projects, you remember the reason that these were put up. In the West, we did not just go out willy-nilly and say, let's put a dam here and let's put a dam there. That did not happen. There are reasons that those dams are there. There are reasons that we have to store that water. And so I urge my colleagues, as the issues of water and storage of water in the West come in front of you, take a deep look at why those projects were built in the first place, why those projects are important for the West.

2030

We have a project we are going to talk about this year, the Animas La-Plata project, a very interesting project. I am going to spend a couple minutes with you right now talking about that.

Years ago, when the population in the East and our leaders back here in the East wanted to settle the West, they ran into a number of different problems. One of the problems were the Indians. My gosh, there are people on this land that we want.

Well, the response to it was, we will push them off it. What do we do with them? Essentially what they did when they got to Colorado is they took the Indians and said, look, we are going to shove you into the mountains. We want the plains. We want the large herds of buffalo. We want the agricultural lands out there. So sorry, Indians, there is not room for you. We are going to shove you into the mountains. So they shoved them into the mountains.

Then what happened was they began to discover minerals in the mountains. The white men found there were gold in the streams, in the creeks. There were massive mineral deposits in those mountains. Those mountains all of a sudden became valuable.

So, what did they do? Time for the Indians to move again. They took the Indians and they moved them down to the southwestern part of Colorado, down into the desert. And, mercifully, somebody in the administration or in the leadership back then said, look, there is no water down there. There is not water for those people in those desert lands. We need to provide some water for them.

So that is exactly what they did. The government provided water rights, and promised the Native Americans, the Indians, as they were called back then, promised water rights for their lands.

Well, years ago when the water projects for the West were authorized,

the government agreed with the Native Americans to go ahead and help develop those water rights. Those were water rights owned by the Native Americans pursuant to treaty.

So as a part of the development of those water rights so the Native Americans could utilize the water they had been promised, that they had contracted for, in order to help them develop it, they promised certain water storage projects, one of them being the Animas La-Plata.

Then what happened was the government began to stall, so the Native Americans decided to sue the Federal Government in the courts, because, as they said, rightfully so, wait a minute, United States Government, we made a deal in Washington. We made a deal. You gave us these water rights in exchange for our lands. You signed a contract. You made a treaty with us to build our water storage project, yet you continue to delay and delay and delay.

So the best government lawyers came in and advised the government leaders at the time, you are going to lose this case. You need to do what you said you were going to do with the Native Americans. You need to build that project.

So the government went to the Native Americans and said let's settle the case. So they settled it. The Native Americans accepted less than they were entitled to, but they were willing to live with that compromise, because they wanted the wet water. They did not want cash, they did not want trinkets, they wanted wet water, water they could put their hands in and feel the wetness.

Well, lo and behold, pretty soon some environmental organizations started suing, and pretty soon there is an effort to stop the building of the Animas La-Plata water project down in Southwestern Colorado.

Once again, who loses? The Native Americans. So the Native Americans come back again, and once again they make an agreement to get even less than what they got the first time they made the agreement and the second time they made the agreement.

Now what do we see in the last couple of years? Once again the United States is continuing to stall and delay. In fact, there have been proposals by some organizations out there, do not give them any water at all. Let us just pay them with some cash. Give them some trinkets. Give them cash.

They do not want cash, they want their water. Fortunately, I think we have come to agreement with the administration this year to move the Animas La-Plata project into reality. It has taken a lot of effort, and I must compliment my colleague, Senator Nighthorse Campbell. This is a big issue out in the West. A lot of effort has been put into it, and hopefully we can get this storage project in the west put together.

Now, when we speak about water it leads us to another issue that I think is

important to understand about the West, and that is the concept of use. If you were ever in Colorado, and there are still a few signs, or actually out in the mountains, out in the West, you still see some of these signs on national lands, and the sign might say, for example, "Welcome, you are entering the White River National Forest." But underneath that sign is another little sign, and it says "The land of many uses." "The land of many uses."

Let us talk a little history. What does multiple use mean? Multiple use means exactly what it says, that the lands out there are not intended for one singular use, that the survivability of many different things, of humans, of animal species, of the environment, it depends on a balanced approach on how to use those lands, and the balanced approach is what is called multiple use.

Now, how did multiple use come about and how is it that the Federal land ownership is so massive out in the West and almost minimal, and "minimal" would be a pretty generous description, in the East?

In order to have an accurate reflection of what I am talking about, I have got a map for you here which shows the United States, obviously. You will see, I ask my colleagues to divert their attention over to the map for a moment, if you really go down this line, which is down the Colorado border, down the Wyoming border, down to Montana, you go down that line, through eastern Colorado, clear down and go along the border there over to New Mexico and around the border of Texas, you will see that practically from this point to the east, from that point to the Atlantic Ocean, Federal Government ownership of land is minimal.

Now, you have got some blocks of land out here in the Appalachians, the Catskill Mountains, some down in the Everglades and some up here in the northeastern section. But take a look at the eastern United States and land ownership there by the government, and compare it with land ownership in the West. In the West, as you can see, most of the land is owned by the Federal Government. In fact, in 11 states here in the West, in 11 states, 47 percent of that land is owned by the Federal Government.

Now, remember, that is not all the government owns, because you have state government lands, you have municipal land, you have special district lands. So there is a lot besides that 47 percent. But because of the fact that you have such massive ownership of public lands, or they call it public lands, such massive ownership by the Federal Government, it creates by its own consequence a lot of differences between the West land uses and land uses in the East.

Now, how did this come about? Why did our leaders not many many years ago who preceded us many, many generations ago, why did they not spread this land ownership out throughout the country more evenly?

Here is what happened. In the West, when they were settling the rest of the country, and I say the West, really anything West of, you get out here of New York, of South Carolina, Kentucky, out into this country, they decided in those days ownership of land was not simply just a deed. The fact you owned a deed to the land did not mean a lot out here in the wilderness, out in the wild areas of the country. In fact, back then possession really was nine-tenths of the law. You have heard that quote many times. "Well, possession is nine-tenths of the law." That is where it came from.

In the early days of the settlement by the white man out here in the West, possession was nine-tenths of the law. So the leaders in the East decided hey, we have got to provide some kind of incentive, we have got to give an incentive for people to move into the West, to settle this land. We have got to get our citizens in possession of that land, the land they had purchased, for example, through the Louisiana purchase. We have got to get people on the land. How do we do it? Because, frankly, life in the city is fairly comfortable. Life in the West is pretty rough. They have to go on horseback, a wagon. It is pretty rough.

Somebody came up with the idea, well, let us do this. Let us tell these settlers that if they go out there, we will give them land. And the American dream has always been to own your own piece of land. Today, for our constituents, the young people, the old people, the middle age people, we all dream of owning our own little piece of land. Ownership of land is American.

So what they said was hey, what stronger incentive can we give to these people to encourage them to become settlers and move to the West than to offer to give them land?

So they said all right, what kind of land should we give? Let us call it, they said, the Homestead Act or any number of other acts, and let us give them 160 or 320 acres. And if they go out and they possess that land and they work that land for a period of time, say 3 years or 5 years, depending on the act, we will let them have the land free. It is their land. It is their land forever.

Well, that worked okay, until you hit the mountains, until you hit the arid areas of the West. When you got into the states like Kansas and Nebraska and Ohio and the Dakotas, you know, you could take 160 acres in that rich farmland of Ohio or Nebraska and you could raise a family on it. That is very fertile ground.

But what was happening was the settlers were coming out here, and all of a sudden they stopped. They were not going into the mountains. Maybe some would go around the mountains and try to find gold in the California area, out here where you do not see much government land ownership in California. They were going around it.

So the problem came back to Washington. Hey, we are doing okay, again

referring to this map, doing okay in the eastern United States, everything east, let us say of Denver, Colorado. People are settling, were possessing the land. But where the Colorado Rockies start, from north to south, west, the people are not going in there. What do we do?

The problem came up, well, you know, to raise a family in Nebraska, for example, on the rich fertile land out there, it is 160 acres. To do the equivalent in the Colorado Rockies, for example, and I keep referring to Colorado, obviously other states share the Rockies, so I am really referring to the mountain West, but to do the equivalent in the mountains, instead of 160 acres, you may need 1,600 acres, or 2,000 acres, or 3,000 acres. The leaders in Washington said wow, we cannot give away that kind of land. We cannot go out there and tell people we are going to give thousand and thousands of acres to one person if they go out and live on and work that land. What do we do?

That is where the birth of the concept of multiple use came about. The Federal Government decided the answer to this, to encourage settlers to go out, is, look, the Federal Government will retain ownership. The Federal Government will continue to own these lands out here, but you are going to be allowed to go out there and use them. You can go out there and use them for ranching, you can go out there and use them for minerals. As time went on, you can go out there and use them to build your communities and your towns and later on your cities. Now, today we can use these lands to help protect our environment, to help preserve a lot of these lands.

Multiple use means a lot of things. To give you an idea of what the multiple use concept is and why Federal ownership differs here in the West than in the East, in the East, for example, let us think about it. If you wanted to build something in your local community here in, let us say Kentucky or out here in Illinois or some of these states more towards the East, you wanted to build something, what do you do? You have to get a permit. And if you get a permit, where do you go? You go to your local planning and zoning. You go down to the city hall, or maybe the county offices, and you go to your local planning and zoning.

Well, here in the West, where the Federal Government owns so much land, if we want to build, for example, a water canal, we do not go to our local planning and zoning. We have to have our planning and zoning done in Washington, D.C., 1,500 miles away, in an area where it rains. It does not rain very much in the West.

2045

It does not rain much in the West. In an area where they have very little Federal ownership of lands, in an area where a lot of people do not even know what the term "use" means, yet they

are the ones who dictate, they are the ones who dictate our planning and zoning in the West. That is a big difference. That is why we have sensitivities out there in the West. That is why it is important that we protect the concept of multiple use.

Let me read just a couple of things. The Federal government owns, as I said earlier, 47 percent of the land in the 11 public lands States all located in the western United States. In four States, the Federal government owns more than half of the land: In Idaho, in Nevada, in Oregon, and Utah. In Colorado, more than one-third of the land is owned by the Federal government.

Are we dependent on these lands? We are absolutely dependent on these lands. Humans could not live out in the West without the permission of the Federal government to use those lands.

Some would say, well, is that not kind of an exaggerated statement? The fact is that it is not exaggerated at all. Think about it. Take any community in my district. Glenwood Springs, Colorado. If you have not been there, go visit; a beautiful community, my hometown. In Glenwood Springs, or a town more that my colleagues might be acquainted with, Aspen, Colorado, take Aspen, Colorado, every road into Aspen, Colorado, comes across government lands. Every drop of water in Aspen, Colorado, either comes across, originates, or is stored on Federal lands unless it is a spring, and then it still originates somewhere on Federal lands. All of their cable, all of their power lines, all of their transportation needs, their airport, their air corridors, all of that comes across Federal lands.

If we begin to shut down the access across Federal lands, we lock out these communities. Many, many of the communities, not only in my district but throughout the U.S., throughout the West, are locked in by Federal lands.

Now, "locked in" is not too harsh a word if we are allowed access to utilize these lands. We take a lot of pride in those lands. That is our birthplace. A lot of us have many, many generations of family history out there. We care about that land. We have worked that land. We know that land.

There are some sensitivities when we deal with people, for example, out of Washington, D.C., some think tank, that thinks they ought to be able to or that they know a little more about the dictates of living in the West, about the issues of these lands.

Multiple use is a very, very important concept for us. That is why we are so ardent in our protection of the right to use these lands. I think this map is a good reflection. Again, I would direct my colleagues to take a look at it.

One thing they will notice down here, it is not in proportion, obviously, is the State of Alaska. I think the State of Alaska is somewhere around 96 percent owned by the government. Ninety-six percent of that land is owned by the government. Think of the impact that that has on the everyday lifestyles of

people; of the resources that they use, of the transportation that they use.

So multiple use is a very, very important concept for us, and I hope that my comments tonight have given Members a little idea about this. There are a lots of exciting things that go on in the West in regard to our land use.

Over the last 25 or 30 years, we have recognized the technology that allows us to utilize our lands in such a way that they can become more environmentally friendly. We have figured out how to use water in a more environmentally sensitive form. There is a lot of progressive movement in the West on these lands to help preserve our environment, because many of those communities out there are almost totally dependent on a clean, healthy environment.

If Aspen, Colorado, for example, or Beaver Creek or Telluride or Vail or Glenwood Springs or Durango, if they had a dirty environment, would Members go out to visit it? Of course not. We have lots to lose out there. We have a lot at risk with our environment out there. That is why we take no shame in the positions that we advocate for the protection of our lands out there, for the protection of the water out there.

I hope my colleagues here recognize that. I hope as the different issues come up, whether they relate to Alaska or whether they relate to the western United States, remember, especially if Members are from the East, that the issues are different. The issues will require that we look into the history. They will require that we study the differences of a State without much Federal land and a State with Federal land, that we study how dependent we are on the resources of those Federal lands, and why the doctrine of multiple use is a well-thought-out and now a well-practiced historical use of those lands. Multiple use should be protected.

There are some areas where we have set aside what we call wilderness areas. I am a sponsor of a wilderness called the Spanish Peaks Wilderness. That is my bill passed out of this House. We expect to put a wilderness out there. We have other wilderness. Senator Armstrong, Hank Brown from years ago, they put in the Flat Tops Wilderness bill.

In some of these areas we take away multiple use, but it is a focused, well-thought-out move. It is a move that allows some lands to be set aside as if humans had never touched them. So in some areas we have actually surrendered the doctrine of multiple use for protection, for the maximum possible, with little flexibility, protection.

But before, and I say this to my colleagues, before Members jump on the bandwagon and take a paintbrush and paint in all of this wilderness designation, please understand the impact that it has to the local people, to the people who live off those lands, to the people who depend on those lands. Frankly, anybody that lives in the

West is dependent upon those Federal lands.

EDUCATION

Enough for issues about water and lands. Now I want to move to an issue that is very important to me. It is important to my colleagues here. I want to talk for a few minutes about some areas of education.

I do not know anyone who is anti-education. I find with interest in a political season how political layouts are made saying one person is anti-education. Granted, in this room of 435 Congress people, we have 435 different ideas, and many of them are uniform, but we have 435 different ideas about education: How do we improve education? How do we get the biggest bang for our buck out of education? How do we get the best teachers, the most qualified teachers we can into the field of education? How do we make the profession of teaching one of the highest professions in our country?

There is lots of debate about that, but I have not found anybody on the Democratic side and I certainly have not found anybody on the Republican side that is anti-education.

So I urge my colleagues, as this election year gets into a very heated process very rapidly, that they not buy into that argument that their opponent or somebody else out there is anti-education. I do not know one person, I have never met a person in my political career, I have never met one person that is anti-education. In fact, I have met very few people, I could probably count them on one hand, the people, if I were to ask them the five or ten most important things in our society, that they would not list education among the very top.

We all recognize that education is fundamental for the strength of this country. Now that we all can come to the agreement that we all agree that education is important, let us talk about different subjects.

There are lots of areas we could talk about. We could talk about the budget on education, about how much more money is needed, how do we have accountability for the money, how do we test, what kind of testing, and should we track scores and the money spent, whether the money should be local money, whether the money should be State money, whether the money should be Federal money; and if it is Federal or State money for a local school, what kind of flexibility should be given to the Federal government or the State government to determine what programs are offered in the local school?

We can talk about the issues of sex education in schools: What level do we offer sex education, should we have it in the schools? We can talk about the school facilities. We can talk about bonding issues. There are lots of things in education that many in this room have much more expertise than I do. We could have lengthy discussions about it. There is a lot of money, bil-

lions and billions of dollars spent in this country every year to try and figure out how we have a better educational product.

But one of the areas I like to talk about in education is personal responsibility, consequences for behavior that is classified as misbehavior. I think throughout the years, and this is where I got some negative calls, and I would love to have some of those people to debate, Mr. Speaker, who in my opinion seem to think that the discipline, the direction we are going in discipline is the right direction to take.

I do not think it is. I think one of the problems that we have today in turning out a better educational product is responsibility in the classroom. We find responsibility in the classroom not only through accountability of measurement, and whether a student is learning, and the responsibility of a student if they want to participate in the class, they have to do their assignments. But I am talking about classroom discipline.

It is interesting, if we take a look at the discipline problems, and I think there is a book out there called *It All Happened in Kindergarten* or something like that. I will actually have it next week. But in that particular book, as my memory serves me, if it is correct, they did some comparisons about discipline problems 40 years ago in our classrooms and the discipline problems today in our classrooms.

Part of the difference in those discipline problems, back then, for example, chewing gum was a discipline problem, or talking out of turn, interrupting your teacher, being tardy. Today it is drugs, violence. We go down the list and there is a dramatic difference.

Part of it is the shift in society. Part of it, and we can track it to a lot of different things, the lack of two-parent families, a number of different things. But one of those elements that I think we need to look at is we have got to give our teachers the ability and the tools to have discipline in their classroom.

Not too many years ago I think it was 60 Minutes went in and did a secret filming I think in one of the major cities of a classroom and the discipline, and the frustrated teacher who could not control those students.

Can most teachers control most students? The answer is yes. Are most students responsible young people, young adults? The answer is yes. In the past, were teachers able to have much more control for those few students who became discipline problems? The answer was yes.

Has that authority had handcuffs placed on it? Has that authority been kind of cornered or reduced in today's classroom? The answer is yes. We need to take a serious look at allowing discipline back into the classroom.

Think about it. I have a sister who is a counselor. Her name is Kathleen. She has spent her career in teaching

and she is now a counselor. Several years ago when I was in the State legislature, and in Colorado most of the money provided for schools is provided at the State level, back then about 63 cents out of every dollar of the general fund of the State of Colorado's budget was provided for education, but we consistently heard complaints about, we need more money for education.

We hear it from every department, by the way. The military says it needs more money. In fact, I have never found a department yet throughout my years of public service that says, whoa, we have enough money. We can do the job for what you have given us. We have enough money. So that is a pretty common complaint.

Anyway, back to my sister, Kathy. I asked her one day, I said, Kathy, if I could do one thing politically as a leader, if I could do just one thing to help improve the education product for you as a schoolteacher, what would it be? I expected her to say, we need more money.

She did not say that. She said, if you could do just one thing, allow me to have discipline back in my classroom. Allow me to have discipline back in my classroom.

That is where I really begin. That answer caught me a little off guard. That is where I began to really focus on discipline in the classroom and tolerance in our schools. Clearly, when we speak of tolerance, there are many different applications that that term can have. There are a lot of things that we have taught, good behavior through more tolerance of certain behaviors.

However, we also need to take a look at misbehavior that we are ignoring because it is not politically correct, perhaps, to stand up to it, or you are going to get criticism for drawing a line in the sand and saying, if your behavior crosses that line, you are out of school.

At some point we have to go back and cater to the majority of students, the students that are behaving. I am not talking about ethnic issues and so on, I am talking about the majority of students that behave. We have to meet their needs. Those needs, in my opinion, take a higher priority than a student who on a consistent basis, not a one- or two-time basis where we have correctable attitudes, but on a consistent basis continues to defy the teacher and continues to defy the rules of the classroom.

For example, not too many months ago I saw some film footage, and some of my colleagues may have seen it, where there was a fight in the school and the students were disciplined.

This school board, I wanted to pat each one of them on the back. It is about time somebody stood up to these students and kicked them out of school; good for you. Teach them a lesson. Of course there was a lot of argument and debate about whether this was too harsh a punishment for kicking these students out of school. Then they begin to look into the background

of the students, and it was the first time I had ever heard the term "third year freshman." So I asked my sister Kathy, what is a third year freshman?

Oh, a third year freshman, she says, that is somebody who has been in high school for 3 years and has yet to get enough credits to get out of the freshman class.

In this particular case that I was referring to, they had some students there who did not have any credits and had been in school for 2 or 3 years; no credits. Then they went and they took a look and investigated and revealed how many days they had been absent from school, and the fundamental question that came to me was not whether or not they still are in school; the fundamental question came to me is why did you not kick them out earlier? How much time and how much effort and how many resources have you spent taking care of these students who are not willing to accept responsibility, who have behavioral problems that are not able to be corrected on a short-term basis and you have kowtowed to them, so to speak, been politically correct to them, at the expense of the students who are following the rules, at the expense of the students, and it is clearly, clearly the strong majority of students who want to learn, who want to get something out of their education, what is wrong out there?

Well, I can say this, that I think as government officials we need to pledge to our local teachers, to our school administrators that, look, within the bounds, within legitimate bounds, and I can say I think the legitimate bounds have a historical basis, I think we can find them, that within those bounds you are going to receive support from us. It may be that you are having to discipline the most popular kid in the town. We have to promise support to these people. These teachers have tough jobs. These administrators have tough jobs. But we cannot really expect them to stand up to this discipline problem if we, starting on this House Floor, do not back them up. There are times where discipline cannot be politically correct. There are times where discipline can be absolutely correct. In my opinion, if we can get discipline back to the classroom, Mr. Speaker, if we can do something to help our local districts, give them the support and to watch very carefully any legislation we pass out of the U.S. House of Representatives to make sure that we are not infringing on the right for a school-teacher to have discipline in their classroom, it is worth it. That is how we can get a better product. That is how we can give more opportunities to our students.

As I said earlier, in my opinion education is the most fundamental pillar that we can have that holds this great country together. Now, there are other strong pillars. We have to have a strong military. We have to have a strong economy. We have to have a strong health care delivery system.

There are other pillars that help hold this building up but education is one that gets a lot of attention, deserves a lot of attention and it is going to get a lot more attention.

Now teachers, I think, themselves want accountability. I read an article in USA Today, December 1999, and it was issued by the Albert Shanker Institute. They found that teachers support standards. Teachers support accountability. Even in low income neighborhoods, teachers believe that standards and accountability are important.

I think most teachers believe in personal responsibilities. I think most teachers want us to give them the tools that create consequences for misbehavior in the classroom, that allow the teachers to reward good behavior because there are two ways to take care of misbehavior. One is punish the misbehavior and have consequences for the misbehavior and two is to reward the good behavior, take the positive drive.

The study shows that the longer teachers work with standards the happier they are to have them. Accountability measures can include repeating a grade or having to pass a test to graduate. Accountability measures can include discipline in the classroom. For school officials, accountability could come in the form of removing teachers and principals from schools that do not meet those standards.

Seventy-three percent of the teachers and 92 percent of the principals favor the standards movement.

Mr. Speaker, let me just conclude by saying that we all want better education. Let us bring discipline back to the classroom.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

2148

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DREIER) at 9 o'clock and 48 minutes p.m.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 290, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 2001

Mr. KASICH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-577) on the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 290) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2001, revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2000, and

setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2002 through 2005, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. 106-577)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 290), establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2001, revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2000, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2002 through 2005, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001.

(a) DECLARATION.—Congress declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2000 is hereby revised and replaced and that this is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2001 and that the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2002 through 2005 are hereby set forth.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2001.

TITLE I—LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

Sec. 101. Recommended levels and amounts.

Sec. 102. Major functional categories.

Sec. 103. Reconciliation in the House of Representatives.

Sec. 104. Reconciliation of revenue reductions in the Senate.

TITLE II—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT AND RULEMAKING

Subtitle A—Budget Enforcement

Sec. 201. Lock-box for social security surpluses.

Sec. 202. Debt reduction lock-box.

Sec. 203. Enhanced enforcement of budgetary limits.

Sec. 204. Mechanisms for strengthening budgetary integrity.

Sec. 205. Emergency designation point of order in the Senate.

Sec. 206. Mechanism for implementing increase of fiscal year 2001 discretionary spending limits.

Sec. 207. Senate firewall for defense and non-defense spending.

Subtitle B—Reserve Funds

Sec. 211. Mechanism for additional debt reduction.

Sec. 212. Reserve fund for additional tax relief and debt reduction.

Sec. 213. Reserve fund for additional surpluses.

Sec. 214. Reserve fund for medicare in the House.

Sec. 215. Reserve fund for medicare in the Senate.

Sec. 216. Reserve fund for agriculture.

Sec. 217. Reserve fund to foster the health of children with disabilities and the employment and independence of their families.

Sec. 218. Reserve fund for military retiree health care.

Sec. 219. Reserve fund for cancer screening and enrollment in SCHIP.

Sec. 220. Reserve fund for stabilization of payments to counties in support of education.

Sec. 221. Tax reduction reserve fund in the Senate.

Sec. 222. Application and effect of changes in allocations and aggregates.

Subtitle C—Miscellaneous Rulemaking Provisions

Sec. 231. Compliance with section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990.

Sec. 232. Prohibition on use of Federal reserve surpluses.

Sec. 233. Reaffirming the prohibition on the use of tax increases for discretionary spending.

Sec. 234. Exercise of rulemaking powers.

TITLE III—SENSE OF CONGRESS, HOUSE, AND SENATE PROVISIONS

Subtitle A—Sense of Congress Provisions

Sec. 301. Sense of Congress on graduate medical education.

Sec. 302. Sense of Congress on providing additional dollars to the classroom.

Subtitle B—Sense of House Provisions

Sec. 311. Sense of the House on waste, fraud, and abuse.

Sec. 312. Sense of the House regarding emergency spending.

Sec. 313. Sense of the House on estimates of the impact of regulations on the private sector.

Sec. 314. Sense of the House on biennial budgeting.

Sec. 315. Sense of the House on access to health insurance and preserving home health services for all medicare beneficiaries.

Sec. 316. Sense of the House regarding Medicare+Choice programs/reimbursement rates.

Sec. 317. Sense of the House on directing the Internal Revenue Service to accept negative numbers in farm income averaging.

Sec. 318. Sense of the House on the importance of the National Science Foundation.

Sec. 319. Sense of the House regarding skilled nursing facilities.

Sec. 320. Sense of the House on special education.

Sec. 321. Sense of the House regarding HCFA draft guidelines.

Sec. 322. Sense of the House on asset-building for the working poor.

Sec. 323. Sense of the House on the importance of supporting the Nation's emergency first-responders.

Sec. 324. Sense of the House on additional health-related tax relief.

Subtitle C—Sense of Senate Provisions

TITLE III—SENSE OF THE SENATE PROVISIONS

Sec. 331. Sense of the Senate supporting funding levels in Educational Opportunities Act.

Sec. 332. Sense of the Senate on additional budgetary resources.

Sec. 333. Sense of the Senate on regarding the inadequacy of the payments for skilled nursing care.

Sec. 334. Sense of the Senate on veterans' medical care.

Sec. 335. Sense of the Senate on impact aid.

Sec. 336. Sense of the Senate on tax simplification.

Sec. 337. Sense of the Senate on antitrust enforcement by the Department of Justice and Federal Trade Commission regarding agriculture mergers and anticompetitive activity.

Sec. 338. Sense of the Senate regarding fair markets for American farmers.

Sec. 339. Sense of the Senate on women and social security reform.

Sec. 340. Use of False Claims Act in combatting medicare fraud.

Sec. 341. Sense of the Senate regarding the National Guard.

Sec. 342. Sense of the Senate regarding military readiness.

Sec. 343. Sense of the Senate supporting funding of digital opportunity initiatives.

Sec. 344. Sense of the Senate on funding for criminal justice.

Sec. 345. Sense of the Senate regarding comprehensive public education reform.

Sec. 346. Sense of the Senate on providing adequate funding for United States international leadership.

Sec. 347. Sense of the Senate concerning the HIV/AIDS crisis.

Sec. 348. Sense of the Senate regarding tribal colleges.

Sec. 349. Sense of the Senate to provide relief from the marriage penalty.

Sec. 350. Sense of the Senate on the continued use of Federal fuel taxes for the construction and rehabilitation of our Nation's highways, bridges, and transit systems.

Sec. 351. Sense of the Senate concerning the price of prescription drugs in the United States.

Sec. 352. Sense of the Senate against Federal funding of smoke shops.

Sec. 353. Sense of the Senate concerning investment of social security trust funds.

Sec. 354. Sense of the Senate on medicare prescription drugs.

Sec. 355. Sense of the Senate concerning funding for new education programs.

Sec. 356. Sense of the Senate regarding enforcement of Federal firearms laws.

Sec. 357. Sense of the Senate that any increase in the minimum wage should be accompanied by tax relief for small businesses.

Sec. 358. Sense of Congress regarding funding for the participation of members of the uniformed services in the Thrift Savings Plan.

Sec. 359. Sense of the Senate concerning uninsured and low-income individuals in medically underserved communities.

TITLE I—LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2000 through 2005:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: \$1,465,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: \$1,503,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$1,548,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003: \$1,598,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004: \$1,652,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005: \$1,719,800,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be reduced are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: \$0.

Fiscal year 2001: \$11,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$23,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003: \$30,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004: \$39,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005: \$44,300,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: \$1,467,300,000.

Fiscal year 2001: \$1,467,200,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$1,499,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003: \$1,606,600,000.

Fiscal year 2004: \$1,661,700,000.

Fiscal year 2005: \$1,724,400,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: \$1,441,100,000.

Fiscal year 2001: \$1,446,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$1,466,400,000.

Fiscal year 2003: \$1,583,300,000.

Fiscal year 2004: \$1,637,100,000.

Fiscal year 2005: \$1,700,500,000.

(4) SURPLUSES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the surpluses are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: \$24,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: \$57,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$81,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003: \$15,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004: \$15,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005: \$19,300,000,000.

(5) PUBLIC DEBT.—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: \$5,628,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: \$5,663,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$5,678,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003: \$5,770,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004: \$5,856,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005: \$5,936,900,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of the debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: \$3,458,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: \$3,253,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$2,999,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003: \$2,804,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004: \$2,594,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005: \$2,363,000,000,000.

(7) SOCIAL SECURITY.—

(A) SOCIAL SECURITY REVENUES.—For purposes of Senate enforcement under section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the amounts of revenues of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: \$479,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: \$501,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$524,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003: \$547,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004: \$569,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005: \$597,300,000,000.

(B) SOCIAL SECURITY OUTLAYS.—For purposes of Senate enforcement under section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the amounts of outlays of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: \$326,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: \$336,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$343,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003: \$351,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004: \$361,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005: \$372,100,000,000.

(C) SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—In the Senate, the amounts of new budget authority and budget outlays of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund for administrative expenses are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$3,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$3,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$3,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$3,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$3,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$3,600,000,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and budget outlays for fiscal years 2000 through 2005 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 2000:
 (A) New budget authority, \$291,600,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$288,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$309,900,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$296,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$309,200,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$303,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$315,600,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$309,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$323,400,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$317,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$331,700,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$328,300,000,000.
 (2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 2000:
 (A) New budget authority, \$22,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$16,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,800,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$18,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,100,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$17,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,100,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$16,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,100,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$16,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,600,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$16,400,000,000.
 (3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 2000:
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,300,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$18,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,300,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$19,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,400,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$20,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,600,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$20,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,800,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$20,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$21,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$20,500,000,000.
 (4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 2000:
 (A) New budget authority, \$1,100,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, — \$600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$1,300,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$0.
Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$200,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, — \$900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$900,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, — \$400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$800,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, — \$500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$800,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, — \$500,000,000.
 (5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 2000:
 (A) New budget authority, \$24,500,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$24,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,100,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$25,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,200,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$25,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$25,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,300,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$25,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,300,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$25,100,000,000.
 (6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2000:
 (A) New budget authority, \$35,300,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$33,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,800,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$18,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$18,500,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$16,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$17,600,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$16,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$17,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$15,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$15,800,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$14,200,000,000.
 (7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2000:
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,600,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$3,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,200,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$2,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,700,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$4,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$9,400,000,000.
 Outlays, \$4,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$13,500,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$8,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$13,400,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$9,500,000,000.
 (8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2000:
 (A) New budget authority, \$54,400,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$46,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$59,300,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$50,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$57,400,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$53,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$58,900,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$55,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$59,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$55,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$59,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$55,700,000,000.
 (9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2000:
 (A) New budget authority, \$11,300,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$10,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$9,300,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$10,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,600,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$9,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,600,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$8,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,500,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$8,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,600,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$7,600,000,000.
 (10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2000:
 (A) New budget authority, \$57,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$61,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$72,600,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$68,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$74,700,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$72,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$75,700,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$74,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$76,700,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$74,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$78,300,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$75,900,000,000.
 (11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2000:
 (A) New budget authority, \$159,200,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$153,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$169,600,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$165,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$179,300,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$177,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$191,200,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$190,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$205,400,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$204,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$221,600,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$220,300,000,000.
 (12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2000:
 (A) New budget authority, \$199,600,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$199,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$217,700,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$218,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$226,600,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$226,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$247,800,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$247,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$266,300,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$266,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$292,700,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$292,700,000,000.
 (13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2000:
 (A) New budget authority, \$238,900,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$248,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$252,300,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$255,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$264,200,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$266,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$273,700,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$276,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$283,500,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$286,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$296,100,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$298,800,000,000.
 (14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2000:
 (A) New budget authority, \$11,500,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$11,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$9,700,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$9,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$11,600,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$11,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$12,300,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$12,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$13,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$13,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, \$13,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$13,800,000,000.

(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$46,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$45,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$47,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$47,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$49,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$48,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, \$50,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$50,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, \$52,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$51,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, \$55,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$55,100,000,000.

(16) Administration of Justice (750):

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$27,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$28,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$28,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$28,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$28,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$28,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, \$28,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$28,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, \$29,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$28,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, \$29,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$29,200,000,000.

(17) General Government (800):

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$13,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$14,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$14,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$14,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$13,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$13,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, \$13,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$13,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, \$13,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$13,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, \$13,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$13,600,000,000.

(18) Net Interest (900):

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$284,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$284,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$286,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$286,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$284,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$284,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, \$278,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$278,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, \$274,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$274,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, \$269,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$269,700,000,000.

(19) Allowances (920):

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, — \$3,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, — \$11,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, — \$64,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, — \$50,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, — \$60,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, — \$72,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, — \$2,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, — \$4,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, — \$2,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, — \$5,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, — \$3,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, — \$6,200,000,000.

(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, — \$34,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, — \$34,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, — \$38,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, — \$38,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, — \$41,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, — \$41,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, — \$40,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, — \$40,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, — \$38,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, — \$38,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, — \$39,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, — \$39,200,000,000.

SEC. 103. RECONCILIATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) SUBMISSIONS PROVIDING TAX RELIEF.—The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report to the House a reconciliation bill—

(1) not later than July 14, 2000; and

(2) not later than September 13, 2000, that consists of changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the total level of revenues by not more than: \$11,600,000,000 for fiscal year 2001, and \$150,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005.

(b) SUBMISSIONS REGARDING DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report to the House a reconciliation bill—

(1) not later than July 14, 2000, that consists of changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the debt held by the public by \$7,500,000,000 for fiscal year 2001; and

(2) not later than September 13, 2000, that consists of changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the debt held by the public by not more than \$19,100,000,000 for fiscal year 2001.

SEC. 104. RECONCILIATION OF REVENUE REDUCTIONS IN THE SENATE.

The Senate Committee on Finance shall report to the Senate a reconciliation bill—

(1) not later than July 14, 2000; and

(2) not later than September 13, 2000, that consists of changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the total level of revenues by not more than: \$11,600,000,000 for fiscal year 2001, and \$150,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005.

TITLE II—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT AND RULEMAKING

Subtitle A—Budget Enforcement

SEC. 201. LOCK-BOX FOR SOCIAL SECURITY SURPLUSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) under the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, the social security trust funds are off-budget for purposes of the President's budget submission and the concurrent resolution on the budget;

(2) the social security trust funds have been running surpluses for 17 years;

(3) these surpluses have been used to implicitly finance the general operations of the Federal Government;

(4) in fiscal year 2001, the social security surplus will be \$166 billion;

(5) this resolution balances the Federal budget without counting the social security surpluses;

(6) the only way to ensure that social security surpluses are not diverted for other purposes is

to balance the budget exclusive of such surpluses; and

(7) Congress and the President should take such steps as are necessary to ensure that future budgets are balanced excluding the surpluses generated by the social security trust funds.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that legislation should be enacted in this session of Congress that would enforce the reduction in debt held by the public assumed in this resolution by the imposition of a statutory limit on such debt or other appropriate means.

(c) POINT OF ORDER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider any revision to this resolution or a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2002, or any amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that sets forth a deficit for any fiscal year.

(2) DEFICIT LEVELS.—For purposes of this subsection, a deficit shall be the level (if any) set forth in the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget for that fiscal year pursuant to section 301(a)(3) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(d) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (c)(1) shall not apply if—

(1) the most recent of the Department of Commerce's advance, preliminary, or final reports of actual real economic growth indicate that the rate of real economic growth for each of the most recently reported quarter and the immediately preceding quarter is less than 1 percent; or

(2) a declaration of war is in effect.

(e) SOCIAL SECURITY LOOK-BACK.—If in fiscal year 2001 the social security surplus is used to finance general operations of the Federal Government, an amount equal to the amount used shall be deducted from the available amount of discretionary spending for fiscal year 2002 for purposes of any concurrent resolution on the budget.

(f) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (c)(1) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required in the Senate to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

SEC. 202. DEBT REDUCTION LOCK-BOX.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives to consider any reported bill or joint resolution, or any amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that would cause a surplus for fiscal year 2001 to be less than the level (as adjusted) set forth in section 101(4) for that fiscal year.

(b) SPECIAL RULE.—The level of the surplus for purposes of subsection (a) shall take into account amounts adjusted under section 314(a)(2)(B) or (C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

SEC. 203. ENHANCED ENFORCEMENT OF BUDGETARY LIMITS.

(a) PROHIBITION ON USE OF DIRECTED SCOREKEEPING.—(1) It shall not be in order in the House to consider any reported bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that contains a directed scorekeeping provision.

(2) As used in this subsection, the term "directed scorekeeping" means directing the Congressional Budget Office or the Office of Management and Budget how to estimate any provision providing discretionary new budget authority in a bill or joint resolution making general appropriations for a fiscal year for budgetary enforcement purposes.

(b) PROHIBITION ON USE OF ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.—(1) It shall not be in order in the House to consider any reported bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that would cause the total level of

discretionary advance appropriations provided for fiscal years after 2001 to exceed \$23,500,000,000 (which represents the total level of advance appropriations for fiscal year 2001).

(2) As used in this subsection, the term "advance appropriation" means any discretionary new budget authority in a bill or joint resolution making general appropriations for fiscal year 2001 that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2001.

(c) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—This section shall cease to have any force or effect on January 1, 2001.

SEC. 204. MECHANISMS FOR STRENGTHENING BUDGETARY INTEGRITY.

(a) **DEFINITION.**—For purposes of this section, the term "budget year" means with respect to a session of Congress, the fiscal year of the Government that starts on October 1 of the calendar year in which that session begins.

(b) **POINT OF ORDER WITH RESPECT TO ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, resolution, amendment, motion or conference report that—

(A) provides an appropriation of new budget authority for any fiscal year after the budget year that is in excess of the amounts provided in paragraph (2); and

(B) provides an appropriation of new budget authority for any fiscal year subsequent to the year after the budget year.

(2) **LIMITATION ON AMOUNTS.**—The total amount, provided in appropriations legislation for the budget year, of appropriations for the subsequent fiscal year shall not exceed \$23,500,000,000.

(c) **POINT OF ORDER WITH RESPECT TO DELAYED OBLIGATIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in paragraph (2), it shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that contains an appropriation of new budget authority for any fiscal year which does not become available upon enactment of such legislation or on the first day of that fiscal year (whichever is later).

(2) **EXCEPTION.**—Paragraph (1) shall not apply with respect to appropriations in the defense category; nor shall it apply to appropriations reoccurring or customary.

(d) **WAIVER AND APPEAL.**—Subsections (b) and (c) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required in the Senate to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

(e) **FORM OF THE POINT OF ORDER.**—A point of order under this section may be raised by a Senator as provided in section 313(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(f) **CONFERENCE REPORTS.**—If a point of order is sustained under this section against a conference report, the report shall be disposed of as provided in section 313(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(g) **PRECATORY AMENDMENTS.**—For purposes of interpreting section 305(b)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, an amendment is not germane if it contains predominately precatory language.

(h) **ADDITIONAL INSTRUCTION.**—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget in the Senate may instruct the Senate Committee on Finance to report legislation to reduce debt held by the public in an amount consistent with section 103.

(i) **SUNSET.**—Except for subsection (g), this section shall expire effective October 1, 2002.

SEC. 205. EMERGENCY DESIGNATION POINT OF ORDER IN THE SENATE.

(a) **DESIGNATIONS.**—

(1) **GUIDANCE.**—In making a designation of a provision of legislation as an emergency requirement under section 251(b)(2)(A) or 252(e) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Con-

trol Act of 1985, the committee report and any statement of managers accompanying that legislation shall analyze whether a proposed emergency requirement meets all the criteria in paragraph (2).

(2) **CRITERIA.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The criteria to be considered in determining whether a proposed expenditure or tax change is an emergency requirement are—

(i) necessary, essential, or vital (not merely useful or beneficial);

(ii) sudden, quickly coming into being, and not building up over time;

(iii) an urgent, pressing, and compelling need requiring immediate action;

(iv) subject to subparagraph (B), unforeseen, unpredictable, and unanticipated; and

(v) not permanent, temporary in nature.

(B) **UNFORESEEN.**—An emergency that is part of an aggregate level of anticipated emergencies, particularly when normally estimated in advance, is not unforeseen.

(3) **JUSTIFICATION FOR FAILURE TO MEET CRITERIA.**—If the proposed emergency requirement does not meet all the criteria set forth in paragraph (2), the committee report or the statement of managers, as the case may be, shall provide a written justification of why the requirement should be accorded emergency status.

(b) **POINT OF ORDER.**—When the Senate is considering a bill, resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report, a point of order may be made by a Senator against an emergency designation in that measure and if the Presiding Officer sustains that point of order, that provision making such a designation shall be stricken from the measure and may not be offered as an amendment from the floor.

(c) **WAIVER AND APPEAL.**—This section may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required in the Senate to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

(d) **DEFINITION OF AN EMERGENCY REQUIREMENT.**—A provision shall be considered an emergency designation if it designates any item an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) or 252(e) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(e) **FORM OF THE POINT OF ORDER.**—A point of order under this section may be raised by a Senator as provided in section 313(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(f) **CONFERENCE REPORTS.**—If a point of order is sustained under this section against a conference report, the report shall be disposed of as provided in section 313(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(g) **EXCEPTION FOR DEFENSE SPENDING.**—Subsection (b) shall not apply against an emergency designation for a provision making discretionary appropriations in the defense category.

SEC. 206. MECHANISM FOR IMPLEMENTING INCREASE OF FISCAL YEAR 2001 DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The Senate finds the following:

(1) Unless and until the discretionary spending limit for fiscal year 2001 is increased, aggregate appropriations which exceed the current law limits would still be out of order in the Senate and subject to a supermajority vote.

(2) The functional totals contained in this concurrent resolution envision a level of discretionary spending for fiscal year 2001 as follows:

(A) For the discretionary category: \$600,296,000,000 in new budget authority and \$592,773,000,000 in outlays.

(B) For the highway category: \$26,920,000,000 in outlays.

(C) For the mass transit category: \$4,639,000,000 in outlays.

(3) To facilitate the Senate completing its legislative responsibilities for the 106th Congress in a timely fashion, it is imperative that the Senate

consider legislation which increases the discretionary spending limit for fiscal year 2001 as soon as possible.

(b) **ADJUSTMENT TO ALLOCATIONS AND OTHER BUDGETARY AGGREGATES AND LEVELS.**—Whenever a bill or joint resolution becomes law that increases the discretionary spending limit for fiscal year 2001 set out in section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House or Senate, as applicable, shall increase the allocation called for in section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to the appropriate Committee on Appropriations and shall also appropriately adjust all other budgetary aggregates and levels contained in this resolution.

(c) **LIMITATION ON ADJUSTMENT.**—An adjustment made pursuant to subsection (b) shall not result in an allocation under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 that exceeds the total budget authority and outlays set forth in subsection (a)(2).

SEC. 207. SENATE FIREWALL FOR DEFENSE AND NONDEFENSE SPENDING.

(a) **DEFINITION.**—In this section, for purposes of enforcement in the Senate for fiscal year 2001, the term "discretionary spending limit" means—

(1) for the defense category, \$310,819,000,000 in new budget authority and \$297,650,000,000 in outlays; and

(2) for the nondefense category, \$289,477,000,000 in new budget authority and \$327,430,000,000 in outlays.

(b) **POINT OF ORDER IN THE SENATE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—After the adjustment to the section 302(a) allocation to the Committee on Appropriations is made pursuant to section 213 and except as provided in paragraph (2), it shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that exceeds any discretionary spending limit set forth in this section.

(2) **EXCEPTION.**—This subsection shall not apply if a declaration of war by Congress is in effect.

(c) **WAIVER AND APPEAL.**—This section may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required in the Senate to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

Subtitle B—Reserve Funds

SEC. 211. MECHANISM FOR ADDITIONAL DEBT REDUCTION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—If any of the legislation described in subsection (b) is vetoed (or does not become law) or any legislation described in subsection (b)(1) or (b)(2) does not become law on or before October 1, 2000, then the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House or Senate, as applicable, may adjust the levels in this concurrent resolution as provided in subsection (c).

(b) **LEGISLATION.**—Any adjustment pursuant to subsection (a) shall be made with respect to—

(1) the reconciliation legislation required by section 103(a) or section 104;

(2) the medicare legislation provided for in section 214 or 215; or

(3) any legislation which reduces revenues and is vetoed.

(c) **ADJUSTMENTS TO BE MADE.**—The adjustment pursuant to subsection (a) shall be—

(1) with respect to the legislation required by section 103(a) or section 104, to decrease the balance displayed on the Senate's pay-as-you-go scorecard and increase the revenue aggregate by the amount set forth in section 103(a) or section 104 (as adjusted, if adjusted, pursuant to section 213) less the amount of any reduction in the current level of revenues which has occurred since the adoption of this concurrent resolution and to decrease the level of debt held by the public

as set forth in section 101(6) by that same amount;

(2) with respect to the legislation provided for in section 214 or section 215, to decrease the balance displayed on the Senate's pay-as-you-go scorecard by the amount set forth in section 214 or section 215 (less the amount of any change in the current level of spending or revenues attributable to section 215) and to decrease the level of debt held by the public as set forth in section 101(6) by that same amount and make the corresponding adjustments to the revenue and spending aggregates and allocations set forth in this resolution; or

(3) with respect to the legislation described by subsection (b)(3), decrease the balance on the Senate's pay-as-you-go scorecard and increase the revenue aggregate for the cost of such legislation and decrease the level of debt held by the public as set forth in section 101(6) by that same amount.

SEC. 212. RESERVE FUND FOR ADDITIONAL TAX RELIEF AND DEBT REDUCTION.

Whenever the Committee on Ways and Means or the Committee on Finance reports any bill, or an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that would cause the level by which Federal revenues should be reduced, as set forth in section 101(1)(B) for such fiscal year or for such period, as adjusted, to be exceeded, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House or Senate, as applicable, may increase the levels by which Federal revenues should be reduced by the amount exceeding such level resulting from such measure, but not to exceed \$1,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2001 and \$25,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005 and make all other appropriate conforming adjustments (after taking into account any other bill or joint resolution enacted during this session of the One Hundred Sixth Congress that would cause a reduction in revenues for fiscal year 2001 or the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005).

SEC. 213. RESERVE FUND FOR ADDITIONAL SURPLUSES.

(a) **REPORTING ADDITIONAL SURPLUSES.**—If the report provided pursuant to section 202(e)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the budget and economic outlook: update (for fiscal years 2001 through 2010) estimates an on-budget surplus for any of fiscal years 2001 through 2005 that exceeds the on-budget surplus set forth in the Congressional Budget Office's March 2000 budget and economic outlook (for fiscal years 2001 through 2010), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House or Senate, as applicable, may make the adjustments as provided in subsection (b).

(b) **ADJUSTMENTS.**—The chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House or Senate, as applicable, may make the following adjustments in an amount not to exceed the difference between the on-budget surpluses in the reports referred to in subsection (a):

(1) Reduce the on-budget revenue aggregate by that amount for such fiscal year.

(2) Adjust the instruction in section 103 or 104 to—

(A) increase the reduction in revenues by that amount for fiscal year 2001;

(B) increase the reduction in revenues by the sum of the amounts for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005; and

(C) in the House only, increase the amount of debt reduction by that amount for fiscal year 2001.

(3) Adjust such other levels in this resolution, as appropriate and the Senate pay-as-you-go scorecard.

(c) **ADDITIONAL DEBT REDUCTION IN THE HOUSE.**—If the Congressional Budget Office estimates an on-budget surplus for fiscal year 2001 in excess of the level set forth in this resolution, then the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House may—

(1) reduce the levels of the public debt and debt held by the public by the amount of such increased on-budget surplus; and

(2) direct the Committee on Ways and Means to report by a date certain an additional reconciliation bill that reduces debt held by the public by such amount.

SEC. 214. RESERVE FUND FOR MEDICARE IN THE HOUSE.

Whenever the Committee on Ways and Means or Committee on Commerce of the House reports a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment thereto is offered (in the House), or a conference report thereon is submitted that reforms the medicare program and provides coverage for prescription drugs, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House may increase the aggregates and allocations of new budget authority (and outlays resulting therefrom) by the amount provided by that measure for that purpose, but not to exceed \$2,000,000,000 in new budget authority and outlays for fiscal year 2001 and \$40,000,000,000 in new budget authority and outlays for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005 (and make all other appropriate conforming adjustments).

SEC. 215. RESERVE FUND FOR MEDICARE IN THE SENATE.

(a) **PRESCRIPTION DRUGS.**—Whenever the Committee on Finance of the Senate reports a bill or joint resolution or a conference report thereon is submitted, which improves access to prescription drugs for medicare beneficiaries, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise committee allocations and other appropriate budgetary levels and limits to accommodate such legislation, provided that such legislation will not reduce the on-budget surplus or increase spending, by more than \$20,000,000,000 over the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005 and will not cause an on-budget deficit in any fiscal year.

(b) **MEDICARE REFORM.**—Whenever the Committee on Finance of the Senate reports a bill or joint resolution, or a conference report thereon is submitted, which improves the solvency of the medicare program without the use of new subsidies from the general fund and improves access to prescription drugs (or continues access provided pursuant to subsection (a)) for medicare beneficiaries, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may change committee allocations and other appropriate budgetary levels and limits to accommodate such legislation, provided that such legislation will not reduce the on-budget surplus or increase spending by more than \$40,000,000,000 (less any amount already provided by the chairman pursuant to subsection (a)) over the period of fiscal years 2001 to 2005 and will not cause an on-budget deficit in any fiscal year.

SEC. 216. RESERVE FUND FOR AGRICULTURE.

If the Committee on Agriculture of the House or the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate reports a bill on or before June 29, 2000, or an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that provides assistance for producers of program crops and specialty crops, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House or Senate, as applicable, may increase the allocation of new budget authority and outlays to that committee for fiscal year 2000 by the amount of new budget authority (and the outlays resulting therefrom) provided by that measure for that purpose not to exceed \$5,500,000,000 in new budget authority and outlays for fiscal year 2000 and \$1,640,000,000 in new budget authority and outlays for fiscal year 2001.

SEC. 217. RESERVE FUND TO FOSTER THE HEALTH OF CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES AND THE EMPLOYMENT AND INDEPENDENCE OF THEIR FAMILIES.

If the Committee on Commerce of the House or the Committee on Finance of the Senate reports a bill, or an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that facilitates children with disabilities receiving needed health care at home, the chairman of the

Committee on the Budget of the House or Senate, as applicable, may increase the allocation of new budget authority and outlays to that committee by the amount of new budget authority (and the outlays resulting therefrom) provided by that measure for that purpose not to exceed \$25,000,000 in new budget authority and outlays for fiscal year 2001 and \$150,000,000 in new budget authority and outlays for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005.

SEC. 218. RESERVE FUND FOR MILITARY RETIREE HEALTH CARE.

If the Committee on Armed Services of the House or the Senate reports the Department of Defense authorization legislation to fund improvements to health care programs for military retirees and their dependents in order to fulfill the promises made to them, or an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House or Senate, as applicable, may increase the allocation of new budget authority and outlays to that committee by the amount of new budget authority (and the outlays resulting therefrom) provided by that measure for that purpose not to exceed \$50,000,000 in new budget authority and outlays for fiscal year 2001 and \$400,000,000 in new budget authority and outlays for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005 if the enactment of such measure will not cause an on-budget deficit for fiscal year 2001 and the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005.

SEC. 219. RESERVE FUND FOR CANCER SCREENING AND ENROLLMENT IN SCHIP.

If the Committee on Commerce of the House or the Committee on Finance of the Senate reports a bill, or an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that accelerates enrollment of uninsured children in medicaid or the State Children's Health Insurance Program or provides medicaid coverage for women diagnosed with cervical and breast cancer through the screening program of the Centers for Disease Control, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House or Senate, as applicable, may increase the allocation of new budget authority and outlays to that committee by the amount of new budget authority (and the outlays resulting therefrom) provided by that measure for that purpose not to exceed \$50,000,000 in new budget authority and outlays for fiscal year 2001 and \$250,000,000 in new budget authority and outlays for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005.

SEC. 220. RESERVE FUND FOR STABILIZATION OF PAYMENTS TO COUNTIES IN SUPPORT OF EDUCATION.

(a) **ADJUSTMENT.**—If the Committee on Agriculture and the Committee on Resources of the House or the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate reports a bill, or an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that provides additional resources for counties and complies with paragraph (2), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House or Senate, as applicable, may increase the allocation of new budget authority and outlays to that committee by the amount of new budget authority (and the outlays resulting therefrom) provided by that measure for that purpose not to exceed \$200,000,000 in new budget authority and outlays for fiscal year 2001 and \$1,100,000,000 in new budget authority and outlays for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005.

(b) **CONDITION.**—Legislation complies with this section if it provides for the stabilization of receipt-based payments to counties that support school and road systems and also provides that a portion of those payments would be dedicated toward local investments in Federal lands within the counties.

SEC. 221. TAX REDUCTION RESERVE FUND IN THE SENATE.

In the Senate, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may reduce the spending and revenue aggregates and may revise committee allocations for legislation that reduces revenues if such legislation will not increase the deficit or decrease the surplus for—

- (1) fiscal year 2001; or
- (2) the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005.

SEC. 222. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

(a) **APPLICATION.**—Any adjustments of allocations and aggregates made pursuant to this resolution shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) **EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.**—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(c) **BUDGET COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS.**—For purposes of this resolution—

(1) the levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for a fiscal year or period of fiscal years shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives or the Senate, as applicable; and

(2) such chairman, as applicable, may make any other necessary adjustments to such levels to carry out this resolution.

Subtitle C—Miscellaneous Rulemaking Provisions**SEC. 231. COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 13301 OF THE BUDGET ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1990.**

(a) In the House, notwithstanding section 302(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the joint explanatory statement accompanying the conference report on any concurrent resolution on the budget shall include in its allocation under section 302(a) of such Act to the Committee on Appropriations amounts for the discretionary administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration that are off-budget pursuant to section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990 (even though such amounts are not included in the conference report on any concurrent resolution on the budget pursuant to such section 13301).

(b) In the House, for purposes of applying section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, estimates of the level of total new budget authority and total outlays provided by a measure shall include any discretionary amounts provided for the Social Security Administration.

SEC. 232. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FEDERAL RESERVE SURPLUSES.

(a) **PURPOSE.**—The purpose of this section is to ensure that transfers from nonbudgetary governmental entities, such as the Federal reserve banks, shall not be used to offset increased on-budget spending when such transfers produce no real budgetary or economic effects.

(b) **BUDGETARY RULE.**—In the Senate, for purposes of points of order under this resolution and the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, provisions contained in any bill, resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that affects any surplus funds of the Federal reserve banks shall not be scored with respect to the level of budget authority, outlays, or revenues contained in such legislation.

SEC. 233. REAFFIRMING THE PROHIBITION ON THE USE OF TAX INCREASES FOR DISCRETIONARY SPENDING.

(a) **PURPOSE.**—The purpose of this section is to reaffirm Congress' belief that the discre-

tionary spending limits should be adhered to and not circumvented by allowing increased taxes to offset discretionary spending.

(b) **RESTATEMENT OF BUDGETARY RULE.**—For purposes of points of order under this resolution and the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, provisions contained in an appropriations bill (or an amendment thereto or a conference report thereon) resulting in increased revenues shall continue to not be scored with respect to the level of budget authority or outlays contained in such legislation.

SEC. 234. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.

Congress adopts the provisions of this title—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, or of that House to which they specifically apply, and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change those rules (so far as they relate to that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

TITLE III—SENSE OF CONGRESS, HOUSE, AND SENATE PROVISIONS**Subtitle A—Sense of Congress Provisions****SEC. 301. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON GRADUATE MEDICAL EDUCATION.**

It is the sense of Congress that funding for graduate medical education for children's hospitals is a high priority in this resolution.

SEC. 302. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON PROVIDING ADDITIONAL DOLLARS TO THE CLASSROOM.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds that—

(1) strengthening America's public schools while respecting State and local control is critically important to the future of our children and our Nation;

(2) education is a local responsibility, a State priority, and a national concern;

(3) a partnership with the Nation's governors, parents, teachers, and principals must take place in order to strengthen public schools and foster educational excellence;

(4) the consolidation of various Federal education programs will benefit our Nation's children, parents, and teachers by sending more dollars directly to the classroom; and

(5) our Nation's children deserve an educational system that will provide opportunities to excel.

(b) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) Congress should enact legislation that would consolidate 31 Federal K-12 education programs; and

(2) the Department of Education, the States, and local educational agencies should work together to ensure that not less than 95 percent of all funds appropriated for the purpose of carrying out elementary and secondary education programs administered by the Department of Education are spent for our children in their classrooms.

Subtitle B—Sense of House Provisions**SEC. 311. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON WASTE, FRAUD, AND ABUSE.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds that—

(1) while the budget may be in balance, it continues to be ridden with waste, fraud, and abuse;

(2) just last month, auditors documented more than \$19,000,000,000 in improper payments each year by such agencies as the Agency of International Development, the Internal Revenue Service, the Social Security Administration, and the Department of Defense;

(3) the General Accounting Office (GAO) recently reported that the financial management practices of some Federal agencies are so poor that it is unable to determine the full extent of improper Government payments; and

(4) the GAO now lists a record number of 25 Federal programs that are at "high risk" of waste, fraud, and abuse.

(b) **SENSE OF THE HOUSE.**—It is the sense of the House that the Committee on the Budget has created task forces to address this issue and that the President should take immediate steps to reduce waste, fraud, and abuse within the Federal Government and report on such actions to Congress and that any resulting savings should be dedicated to debt reduction and tax relief.

SEC. 312. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING EMERGENCY SPENDING.

It is the sense of the House that, as part of a comprehensive reform of the budget process, the Committees on the Budget should develop a definition of, and a process for, funding emergencies consistent with the applicable provisions of H.R. 853, the Comprehensive Budget Process Reform Act of 1999, that could be incorporated into the Rules of the House of Representatives and the Standing Rules of the Senate.

SEC. 313. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON ESTIMATES OF THE IMPACT OF REGULATIONS ON THE PRIVATE SECTOR.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds that—

(1) the Federal regulatory system sometimes adversely affects many Americans and businesses by imposing financial burdens with little corresponding public benefit;

(2) currently, Congress has no general mechanism for assessing the financial impact of regulatory activities on the private sector;

(3) Congress is ultimately responsible for making sure agencies act in accordance with congressional intent and, while the executive branch is responsible for promulgating regulations, Congress should curb ineffective regulations by using its oversight and regulatory powers; and

(4) a variety of reforms have been suggested to increase congressional oversight over regulatory activity, including directing the President to prepare an annual accounting statement containing several cost/benefit analyses, recommendations to reform inefficient regulatory programs, and an identification and analysis of duplications and inconsistencies among such programs.

(b) **SENSE OF THE HOUSE.**—It is the sense of the House that the House should reclaim its role as reformer and take the first step toward curbing inefficient regulatory activity by passing legislation authorizing the Congressional Budget Office to prepare regular estimates on the impact of proposed Federal regulations on the private sector.

SEC. 314. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON BIENNIAL BUDGETING.

It is the sense of the House that there is a wide range of views on the advisability of biennial budgeting and this issue should be considered only within the context of comprehensive budget process reform.

SEC. 315. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON ACCESS TO HEALTH INSURANCE AND PRESERVING HOME HEALTH SERVICES FOR ALL MEDICARE BENEFICIARIES.

(a) **ACCESS TO HEALTH INSURANCE.**—

(1) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds that—

(A) 44.4 million Americans are currently without health insurance, and that this number is expected to rise to nearly 60 million people in the next 10 years;

(B) the cost of health insurance continues to rise, a key factor in increasing the number of uninsured; and

(C) there is a consensus that working Americans and their families will suffer from reduced access to health insurance.

(2) **SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON IMPROVING ACCESS TO HEALTH CARE INSURANCE.**—It is the sense of the House that access to affordable health care coverage for all Americans is a priority of the 106th Congress.

(b) **PRESERVING HOME HEALTH SERVICE FOR ALL MEDICARE BENEFICIARIES.**—

(1) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds that—

(A) the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 reformed medicare home health care spending by instructing the Health Care Financing Administration to implement a prospective payment system and instituted an interim payment system to achieve savings;

(B) the medicare, medicaid, and SCHIP Balanced Budget Refinement Act, 1999, reformed the interim payment system to increase reimbursements to low-cost providers and delayed the automatic 15 percent payment reduction until after the first year of the implementation of the prospective payment system; and

(C) patients whose care is more extensive and expensive than the typical medicare patient do not receive supplemental payments in the interim payment system but will receive special protection in the home health care prospective payment system.

(2) **SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON ACCESS TO HOME HEALTH CARE.**—It is the sense of the House that—

(A) Congress recognizes the importance of home health care for seniors and disabled citizens;

(B) Congress and the Administration should work together to maintain quality care for patients whose care is more extensive and expensive than the typical medicare patient, including the most ill and infirmed medicare beneficiaries, while home health care agencies operate in the interim payment system; and

(C) Congress and the Administration should work together to avoid the implementation of the 15 percent reduction in the prospective payment system and ensure timely implementation of that system.

SEC. 316. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING MEDICARE+CHOICE PROGRAMS/REIMBURSEMENT RATES.

It is the sense of the House that the Medicare+Choice regional disparity among reimbursement rates is unfair, and that full funding of the Medicare+Choice program is a priority as Congress considers any medicare reform legislation.

SEC. 317. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON DIRECTING THE INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE TO ACCEPT NEGATIVE NUMBERS IN FARM INCOME AVERAGING.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds that—

(1) farmers' and ranchers' incomes vary widely from year-to-year due to uncontrollable markets and unpredictable weather;

(2) in the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997, Congress enacted 3-year farm income averaging to protect agricultural producers from excessive tax rates in profitable years;

(3) last year, the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) proposed final regulations for averaging farm income, which failed to make clear that taxable income in a given year may be a negative number; and

(4) this IRS interpretation can result in farmers paying additional taxes during years in which they experience a loss in income.

(b) **SENSE OF THE HOUSE.**—It is the sense of the House that legislation should be considered during this session of the 106th Congress to direct the Internal Revenue Service to count any net loss of income in determining the proper rate of taxation.

SEC. 318. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON THE IMPORTANCE OF THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds that—

(1) the year 2000 will mark the 50th Anniversary of the National Science Foundation;

(2) the National Science Foundation is the largest supporter of basic research in the Federal Government;

(3) the National Science Foundation is the second largest supporter of university-based research;

(4) research conducted by the grantees of the National Science Foundation has led to innovations that have dramatically improved the quality of life of all Americans;

(5) grants made by the National Science Foundation have been a crucial factor in the development of important technologies that Americans take for granted, such as lasers, Magnetic Resonance Imaging, Doppler Radar, and the Internet;

(6) because basic research funded by the National Science Foundation is high-risk, cutting edge, fundamental, and may not produce tangible benefits for over a decade, the Federal Government is uniquely suited to support such research; and

(7) the National Science Foundation's focus on peer-reviewed merit based grants represents a model for research agencies across the Federal Government.

(b) **SENSE OF THE HOUSE.**—It is the sense of the House that the function 250 (Basic Science) levels assume an amount of funding which ensures that the National Science Foundation is a priority in the resolution; and that the National Science Foundation's critical role in funding basic research, which leads to the innovations that assure the Nation's economic future, and cultivate America's intellectual infrastructure, should be recognized.

SEC. 319. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING SKILLED NURSING FACILITIES.

It is the sense of the House that the Medicare Payment Advisory Commission should continue to carefully monitor the medicare skilled nursing benefit to determine if payment rates are sufficient to provide quality care, and that if reform is recommended, Congress should pass legislation as quickly as possible to assure quality skilled nursing care.

SEC. 320. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON SPECIAL EDUCATION.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds that—

(1) all children deserve a quality education, including children with disabilities;

(2) the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act provides that the Federal, State, and local governments are to share in the expense of educating children with disabilities and commits the Federal Government to pay up to 40 percent of the national average per pupil expenditure for children with disabilities;

(3) the high cost of educating children with disabilities and the Federal Government's failure to fully meet its obligation under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act stretches limited State and local education funds, creating difficulty in providing a quality education to all students, including children with disabilities;

(4) the current level of Federal funding to States and localities under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act is contrary to the goal of ensuring that children with disabilities receive a quality education;

(5) the Federal Government has failed to appropriate 40 percent of the national average per pupil expenditure per child with a disability as required under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to assist States and localities to educate children with disabilities; and

(6) the levels in function 500 (Education) for fiscal year 2001 assume sufficient discretionary budget authority to accommodate fiscal year 2001 appropriations for IDEA, at least \$2,000,000,000 above such funding levels appropriated in fiscal year 2000.

(b) **SENSE OF THE HOUSE.**—It is the sense of the House that—

(1) function 500 (Education) levels assume at least a \$2,000,000,000 increase in fiscal year 2001 over the current fiscal year to reflect the commitment of Congress to appropriate 40 percent of the national per pupil expenditure for children with disabilities by a date certain;

(2) Congress and the President should increase fiscal year 2001 funding for programs under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act by at least \$2,000,000,000 above fiscal year 2000 appropriated levels;

(3) Congress and the President should give programs under the Individuals with Disabilities

Education Act the highest priority among Federal elementary and secondary education programs by meeting the commitment to fund the maximum State grant allocation for educating children with disabilities under such Act prior to authorizing or appropriating funds for any new education initiative;

(4) Congress and the President may consider, if new or increased funding is authorized or appropriated for any elementary and secondary education initiative that directs funds to local educational agencies, providing the flexibility in such authorization or appropriation necessary to allow local educational agencies the authority to use such funds for programs under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act; and

(5) if a local educational agency chooses to utilize the authority under section 613(a)(2)(C)(i) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to treat as local funds up to 20 percent of the amount of funds the agency receives under part B of such Act that exceeds the amount it received under that part for the previous fiscal year, then the agency should use those local funds to provide additional funding for any Federal, State, or local education program.

SEC. 321. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING HCFA DRAFT GUIDELINES.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds that—

(1) on February 15, 2000, the Health Care Financing Administration within the Department of Health and Human Services issued a draft Medicaid School-Based Administrative Claiming (MAC) Guide; and

(2) in its introduction, the stated purpose of the draft MAC guide is to provide information for schools, State medicaid agencies, HCFA staff, and other interested parties on the existing requirements for claiming Federal funds under the medicaid program for the costs of administrative activities, such as medicaid outreach, that are performed in the school setting associated with school-based health services programs.

(b) **SENSE OF THE HOUSE.**—It is the sense of the House that—

(1) many school-based health programs provide a broad range of services that are covered by medicaid, affording access to care for children who otherwise might well go without needed services;

(2) such programs also can play a powerful role in identifying and enrolling children who are eligible for medicaid, as well as the State Children's Health Insurance programs;

(3) undue administrative burdens may be placed on school districts and States and deter timely application approval;

(4) the Health Care Financing Administration should substantially revise the current draft MAC guide because it appears to promulgate new rules that place excessive administrative burdens on participating school districts;

(5) the goal of the revised guide should be to encourage the appropriate use of medicaid school-based services without undue administrative burdens; and

(6) the best way to ensure the continued viability of medicaid school-based services is to guarantee that the guidelines are fair and responsible.

SEC. 322. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON ASSET-BUILDING FOR THE WORKING POOR.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds that—

(1) 33 percent of all American households and 60 percent of African American households have either no financial assets or negative financial assets;

(2) 46.9 percent of children in America live in households with no financial assets, including 40 percent of Caucasian children and 75 percent of African American children;

(3) incentives, including individual development accounts, are tools demonstrating success at empowering low-income workers;

(5) middle and upper income Americans currently benefit from tax incentives for building assets; and

(6) the Federal Government should utilize the Federal tax code to provide low-income Americans with incentives to work and build assets in order to permanently escape poverty.

(b) **SENSE OF THE HOUSE.**—It is the sense of the House that the provisions of this resolution assume that Congress should modify the Federal tax law to include Individual Development Account provisions in order to encourage low-income workers and their families to save for buying a first home, starting a business, obtaining an education, or taking other measures to prepare for the future.

SEC. 323. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON THE IMPORTANCE OF SUPPORTING THE NATION'S EMERGENCY FIRST-RESPONDERS.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds that—

(1) over 1.2 million men and women work as fire and emergency services personnel in 32,000 fire and emergency medical services departments across the Nation;

(2) over 80 percent of those who serve do so as volunteers;

(3) the Nation's firefighters responded to more than 18 million calls in 1998, including over 1.7 million fires;

(4) an average of 100 firefighters per year lose their lives in the course of their duties; and

(5) the Federal Government has a role in protecting the health and safety of the Nation's fire fighting personnel.

(b) **SENSE OF THE HOUSE.**—It is the sense of the House that—

(1) the Nation's firefighters and emergency services crucial role in preserving and protecting life and property should be recognized, and such Federal assistance as low-interest loan programs, community development block grant reforms, emergency radio spectrum reallocations, and volunteer fire assistance programs, should be considered; and

(2) additional resources should be set aside for such assistance.

SEC. 324. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON ADDITIONAL HEALTH-RELATED TAX RELIEF.

It is the sense of the House that the reserve fund set forth in section 213 assumes \$446,000,000 in fiscal year 2001 and \$4,352,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005 for health-related tax provisions comparable to those contained in H.R. 2990 (as passed by the House).

Subtitle C—Sense of Senate Provisions

TITLE III—SENSE OF THE SENATE PROVISIONS

SEC. 331. SENSE OF THE SENATE SUPPORTING FUNDING LEVELS IN EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES ACT.

It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that of the amounts provided for elementary and secondary education within the Budget Function 500 of this resolution for fiscal years 2001 through 2005, such funds shall be appropriated in proportion to and in accordance with the levels authorized in the Educational Opportunities Act, S. 2.

SEC. 332. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON ADDITIONAL BUDGETARY RESOURCES.

It is the sense of the Senate that the levels contained in this resolution assume that—

(1) there are billions of dollars in wasted expenditures in the Federal Government that should be eliminated; and

(2) higher projected budget surpluses arising from reductions in government waste and stronger revenue inflows could be used in the future for additional tax relief or debt reduction.

SEC. 333. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON REGARDING THE INADEQUACY OF THE PAYMENTS FOR SKILLED NURSING CARE.

It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that—

(1) the Administration should identify areas where they have the authority to make changes to improve quality, including analyzing and fix-

ing the labor component of the skilled nursing facility market basket update factor; and

(2) while Congress deliberates funding structural medicare reform and the addition of a prescription drug benefit, it must maintain the continued viability of the current skilled nursing benefit. Therefore, the committees of jurisdiction should ensure that medicare beneficiaries requiring skilled nursing care have access to that care and that those providers have the resources to meet the expectation for high quality care.

SEC. 334. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON VETERANS' MEDICAL CARE.

It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume an increase of \$1,400,000,000 in veterans' medical care appropriations in fiscal year 2001.

SEC. 335. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON IMPACT AID.

It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that the Impact Aid Program strive to reach the goal that all local educational agencies eligible for Impact Aid receive at a minimum, 40 percent of their maximum payment under sections 8002 and 8003.

SEC. 336. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON TAX SIMPLIFICATION.

It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that the Joint Committee on Taxation shall develop a report and alternative proposals on tax simplification by the end of the year, and the Department of the Treasury is requested to develop a report and alternative proposals on tax simplification by the end of the year.

SEC. 337. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON ANTITRUST ENFORCEMENT BY THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE AND FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION REGARDING AGRICULTURE MERGERS AND ANTI-COMPETITIVE ACTIVITY.

It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that—

(1) the Antitrust Division and the Bureau of Competition will have adequate resources to enable them to meet their statutory requirements, including those related to reviewing increasingly numerous and complex mergers and investigating and prosecuting anticompetitive business activity; and

(2) these departments will—

(A) dedicate considerable resources to matters and transactions dealing with agri-business antitrust and competition; and

(B) ensure that all vertical and horizontal mergers implicating agriculture and all complaints regarding possible anticompetitive business practices in the agriculture industry will receive extraordinary scrutiny.

SEC. 338. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING FAIR MARKETS FOR AMERICAN FARMERS.

It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that—

(1) the United States should take steps to increase support for American farmers in order to level the playing field for United States agricultural producers and increase the leverage of the United States in World Trade Organization negotiations on agriculture as long as such support is not trade distorting, and does not otherwise exceed or impair existing Uruguay Round obligations; and

(2) such actions should improve United States farm income and restore the prosperity of rural communities.

SEC. 339. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON WOMEN AND SOCIAL SECURITY REFORM.

It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that—

(1) women face unique obstacles in ensuring retirement security and survivor and disability stability;

(2) social security plays an essential role in guaranteeing inflation-protected financial stability for women throughout their old age;

(3) Congress and the Administration should act, as part of social security reform, to ensure

that widows and other poor elderly women receive more adequate benefits that reduce their poverty rates and that women, under whatever approach is taken to reform social security, should receive no lesser a share of overall federally funded retirement benefits than they receive today; and

(4) the sacrifice that women make to care for their family should be recognized during reform of social security and that women should not be penalized by taking an average of 11.5 years out of their careers to care for their family.

SEC. 340. USE OF FALSE CLAIMS ACT IN COMBATING MEDICARE FRAUD.

It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that chapter 37 of title 31, United States Code (commonly referred to as the False Claims Act) and the qui tam provisions of that chapter are essential tools in combatting medicare fraud and should not be weakened in any way.

SEC. 341. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE NATIONAL GUARD.

It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in the resolution assume that the Department of Defense will give priority to funding the Active Guard/Reserves and Military Technicians at levels authorized by Congress in the fiscal year 2000 Department of Defense authorization bill.

SEC. 342. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING MILITARY READINESS.

It is the sense of the Senate that the functional totals in the budget resolution assume that Congress will protect the Department of Defense's readiness accounts, including spares and repair parts, and operations and maintenance, and use the requested levels as the minimum baseline for fiscal year 2001 authorization and appropriations.

SEC. 343. SENSE OF THE SENATE SUPPORTING FUNDING OF DIGITAL OPPORTUNITY INITIATIVES.

It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that the Committees on Appropriations and Finance should support efforts that address the digital divide, including tax incentives and funding to—

(1) broaden access to information technologies;

(2) provide workers and teachers with information technology training;

(3) promote innovative online content and software applications that will improve commerce, education, and quality of life; and

(4) help provide information and communications technology to underserved communities.

SEC. 344. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON FUNDING FOR CRIMINAL JUSTICE.

It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that funds to improve the justice system will be available as follows:

(1) \$665,000,000 for the expanded support of direct Federal enforcement, adjudicative, and correctional-detention activities.

(2) \$50,000,000 in additional funds to combat terrorism, including cyber crime.

(3) \$41,000,000 in additional funds for construction costs for the Federal Bureau of Prisons and the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center.

(4) \$200,000,000 in support of Customs and Immigration and Nationalization Service port of entry officers for the development and implementation of the ACE computer system designed to meet critical trade and border security needs.

(5) Funding is available for the continuation of such programs as: the Byrne Grant Program, Violence Against Women, Juvenile Accountability Block Grants, First Responder Training, Local Law Enforcement Block Grants, Weed and Seed, Violent Offender Incarceration and Truth in Sentencing, State Criminal Alien Assistance Program, Drug Courts, Residential Substance Abuse Treatment, Crime Identification Technologies, Bulletproof Vests, Counterterrorism, Interagency Law Enforcement Coordination.

SEC. 345. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING COMPREHENSIVE PUBLIC EDUCATION REFORM.

It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that the Federal Government should support State and local educational agencies engaged in comprehensive reform of their public education system and that any public education reform should include at least the following principles:

(1) Every child should begin school ready to learn.

(2) Training and development for principals and teachers should be a priority.

SEC. 346. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON PROVIDING ADEQUATE FUNDING FOR UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL LEADERSHIP.

It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that additional budgetary resources should be identified for function 150 to enable successful United States international leadership.

SEC. 347. SENSE OF THE SENATE CONCERNING THE HIV/AIDS CRISIS.

It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the functional totals underlying this resolution on the budget assume that Congress has recognized the catastrophic effects of the HIV/AIDS epidemic, particularly in sub-Saharan Africa, and seeks to maximize the effectiveness of the United States' efforts to combat the disease through any necessary authorization or appropriations;

(2) Congress should strengthen ongoing programs which address education and prevention, testing, the care of AIDS orphans, and improving home and community-based care options for those living with AIDS; and

(3) Congress should seek additional or new tools to combat the epidemic, including initiatives to encourage vaccine development and programs aimed at preventing mother-to-child transmission of the disease.

SEC. 348. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING TRIBAL COLLEGES.

It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that—

(1) the Senate recognizes the funding difficulties faced by tribal colleges and assumes that priority consideration will be provided to them through funding for the Tribally Controlled College and University Act, the 1994 Land Grant Institutions, and title III of the Higher Education Act; and

(2) such priority consideration reflects Congress' intent to continue work toward current statutory Federal funding goals for the tribal colleges.

SEC. 349. SENSE OF THE SENATE TO PROVIDE RELIEF FROM THE MARRIAGE PENALTY.

It is the sense of the Senate that the level in this budget resolution assume that Congress shall—

(1) pass marriage penalty tax relief legislation that begins a phase down of this penalty in 2001; and

(2) consider such legislation prior to April 15, 2000.

SEC. 350. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON THE CONTINUED USE OF FEDERAL FUEL TAXES FOR THE CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION OF OUR NATION'S HIGHWAYS, BRIDGES, AND TRANSIT SYSTEMS.

It is the sense of the Senate that the functional totals in this budget resolution do not assume the reduction of any Federal gasoline taxes on either a temporary or permanent basis.

SEC. 351. SENSE OF THE SENATE CONCERNING THE PRICE OF PRESCRIPTION DRUGS IN THE UNITED STATES.

It is the sense of the Senate that the budgetary levels in this resolution assume that the cost disparity between identical prescription drugs sold in the United States, Canada, and Mexico should be reduced or eliminated.

SEC. 352. SENSE OF THE SENATE AGAINST FEDERAL FUNDING OF SMOKE SHOPS.

It is the sense of the Senate that the budget levels in this resolution assume that no Federal funds may be used by the Department of Housing and Urban Development to provide any grant or other assistance to construct, operate, or otherwise benefit a smoke shop or other tobacco outlet.

SEC. 353. SENSE OF THE SENATE CONCERNING INVESTMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUNDS.

It is the sense of the Senate that the assumptions underlying the functional totals in this resolution assume that the Federal Government should not directly invest contributions made to the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund established under section 201 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401), or any interest derived from those contributions, in private financial markets.

SEC. 354. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUGS.

It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this budget resolution assume that among its reform options, Congress should explore a medicare prescription drug proposal that—

(1) is voluntary;

(2) increases access for all medicare beneficiaries;

(3) is designed to provide meaningful protection and bargaining power for medicare beneficiaries in obtaining prescription drugs;

(4) is affordable for all medicare beneficiaries and for the medicare program;

(5) is administered using private sector entities and competitive purchasing techniques;

(6) is consistent with broader medicare reform;

(7) preserves and protects the financial integrity of the medicare trust funds;

(8) does not increase medicare beneficiary premiums; and

(9) provides a prescription drug benefit as soon as possible.

SEC. 355. SENSE OF THE SENATE CONCERNING FUNDING FOR NEW EDUCATION PROGRAMS.

It is the sense of the Senate that the budgetary levels in this resolution assume that Congress' first priority should be to fully fund the programs described under part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1411 et seq.) at the originally promised level of 40 percent before Federal funds are appropriated for new education programs.

SEC. 356. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING ENFORCEMENT OF FEDERAL FIREARMS LAWS.

It is the sense of the Senate that the assumptions underlying the functional totals in this concurrent resolution on the budget assume that Federal funds will be used for an effective law enforcement strategy requiring a commitment to enforcing existing Federal firearms laws by—

(1) designating not less than 1 Assistant United States Attorney in each district to prosecute Federal firearms violations and thereby expand Project Exile nationally;

(2) upgrading the national instant criminal background system established under section 103(b) of the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act (18 U.S.C. 922 note) by encouraging States to place mental health adjudications on that system and by improving the overall speed and efficiency of that system; and

(3) providing incentive grants to States to encourage States to impose mandatory minimum sentences for firearm offenses based on section 924(c) of title 18, United States Code, and to prosecute those offenses in State court.

SEC. 357. SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT ANY INCREASE IN THE MINIMUM WAGE SHOULD BE ACCOMPANIED BY TAX RELIEF FOR SMALL BUSINESSES.

It is the sense of the Senate that the functional totals underlying this resolution on the budget assume that the minimum wage should

be increased as provided for in amendment number 2547, the Domenici and others amendment to S. 625, the Bankruptcy Reform legislation.

SEC. 358. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING FUNDING FOR THE PARTICIPATION OF MEMBERS OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES IN THE THRIFT SAVINGS PLAN.

It is the sense of Congress that the levels of funding for the defense category in this resolution—

(1) assume that members of the Armed Forces are to be authorized to participate in the Thrift Savings Plan; and

(2) provide the \$980,000,000 necessary to offset the reduced tax revenue resulting from that participation through fiscal year 2009.

SEC. 359. SENSE OF THE SENATE CONCERNING UNINSURED AND LOW-INCOME INDIVIDUALS IN MEDICALLY UNDERSERVED COMMUNITIES.

It is the sense of the Senate that the functional totals underlying this resolution on the budget assume that—

(1) appropriations for consolidated health centers under section 330 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254b) should be increased by 100 percent over the next 5 fiscal years in order to double the number of individuals who receive health care services at community, migrant, homeless, and public housing health centers; and

(2) appropriations for consolidated health centers should be increased by \$150,000,000 in fiscal year 2001 over the amount appropriated for such centers in fiscal year 2000.

And the Senate agree to the same.

JOHN R. KASICH,
SAXBY CHAMBLISS,
CHRISTOPHER SHAYS,

Managers on the Part of the House.

PETE DOMENICI,
CHUCK GRASSLEY,
C.S. BOND,
SLADE GORTON,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 290), establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2001, revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2000, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2002 through 2005, submit the following joint statement to the House and the Senate in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate amendment struck all of the House bill after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute text.

The House recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate with an amendment that is a substitute for the House bill and the Senate amendment. The differences between the House bill, the Senate amendment, and the substitute agreed to in conference are noted below, except for clerical corrections, conforming changes made necessary by agreements reached by the conferees, and minor drafting and clerical changes.

The conferees intend that to the extent that the legislative text in the conference report is the same as in the House or Senate-passed resolutions, the corresponding sections in the House Report 106-530 and Senate Report 106-251 remain a source of legislative history of the drafters' intent on the concurrent resolution.

DECLARATION

House resolution

The House resolution revises the budgetary levels for fiscal year 2000 and establishes the appropriate levels for fiscal year 2001, and for fiscal years 2002, 2003, 2004, and 2005.

Senate amendment

The Senate resolution revises the budgetary levels for fiscal year 2000 and establishes the appropriate levels for fiscal year 2001, and for fiscal years 2002, 2003, 2004, and 2005.

Conference agreement

The Conference Agreement revises and replaces the budgetary levels for the current year, fiscal year 2000, as established by the report accompanying H. Con. Res. 68, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2000 (H. Rept. 106-91); establishes the levels for the budget year, fiscal year 2001; establishes levels and for each of the 4 out-years, fiscal years 2002, 2003, 2004, and 2005.

The authority to revise the current year levels is set forth in section 304 of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 [Budget Act]. These revised levels

supersede those established and adjusted pursuant to H. Con. Res. 68 for all purposes under the Budget Act, including to enforce sections 302(f) and 311(a) of the Budget Act with respect to fiscal year 2000.

DISPLAY OF LEVELS AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

The required contents of the concurrent resolution on the budget are set forth in section 301(a) of the Budget Act.

House resolution

The House resolution includes amounts for the following budgetary totals required pursuant to section 301(a) of the Budget Act: totals of new budget authority, outlays, revenue, the levels by which revenues should be reduced, surpluses, and public debt.

Senate amendment

Title I of the Senate amendment contains a provision to focus attention on levels of debt held by the public. Section 101(6) provides advisory debt held by the public levels. These debt held by the public levels reflect the fact that the resolution devotes the entire Social Security surplus to the reduction of debt held by the public.

Section 101(c) shows (for informational purposes only) the level of budget authority and outlays for Social Security administrative expenses. These expenses, as is the case with all expenditures from the Social Security trust funds, are off-budget; however for scoring purposes they are counted against the discretionary spending limits because they are provided annually in appropriations acts.

Conference agreement

Title I of the Conference Agreement includes the amounts required for both the House and Senate by section 301(a) of the Budget Act.

For purposes of enforcement in the Senate of section 311(a)(3) of the Budget Act, the Conference Agreement also includes the unified totals for revenue and outlays for the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance and Disability Insurance Trust Funds.

The Conference Agreement includes appropriate levels for debt held by the public as were included in the Senate amendment with an amendment modifying the amounts.

HOUSE-PASSED BUDGET RESOLUTION MANDATORY SPENDING

[In billions of dollars]

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2001-05
SUMMARY							
Total Mandatory Spending:							
BA	1223.6	1260.1	1289.9	1336.9	1387.6	1446.8	6721.3
O	1168.8	1201.1	1237.1	1282.4	1333.9	1392.7	6447.2
On-budget:							
BA	900.1	927.6	950.6	988.4	1029.8	1077.8	4974.2
O	845.3	868.6	897.7	933.8	976.2	1023.7	4700
Off-budget:							
BA	323.5	332.5	339.4	348.5	357.7	369	1747.1
O	323.5	332.5	339.4	348.5	357.7	369	1747.1
BY FUNCTION							
National Defense (050):							
BA	-1	-1	-0.9	-0.9	-0.8	-0.8	-4.4
O	-1	-1	-0.9	-0.9	-0.8	-0.8	-4.4
International Affairs (150):							
BA	-2.2	-0.2	0	0	0	0.2	0
O	-4.6	-4	-3.8	-3.7	-3.5	-3.4	-18.4
General Science, Space, and Technology (250):							
BA	0.1	0.1	0	0	0	0	0.1
O	0.1	0.1	0.1	0	0	0	0.2
Energy (270):							
BA	-1.5	-1.6	-1.9	-1.9	-1.8	-1.9	-9.1
O	-3.6	-2.9	-3.1	-3.2	-3.2	-3.2	-15.6
Natural Resources and Environment (300):							
BA	0.3	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	3.5
O	0.5	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.6	3.4
Agriculture (350):							
BA	31.2	14.6	14	13.1	12.5	11.3	65.5
O	29.8	12.5	12.3	11.5	11.1	9.8	57.2
Commerce and Housing Credit (370):							
BA	1.6	4.2	5.9	7.2	10.5	10.5	38.3
O	-3.2	-0.3	2.3	2.5	5.6	6.6	16.7
On-budget:							
BA	0.6	3.6	5.6	6.4	10.5	10.5	36.6
O	-4.2	-0.9	2	1.7	5.6	6.6	15
Off-budget:							
BA	1	0.6	0.3	0.8	0	0	1.7
O	1	0.6	0.3	0.8	0	0	1.7
Transportation (400):							
BA	39.9	43.5	41.1	42	42	42	210.6
O	2.3	2.1	1.7	1.9	1.9	1.8	9.4
Community and Regional Development (450):							
BA	-0.2	0	0	-0.1	-0.1	0	-0.2
O	-0.7	-0.6	-0.6	-0.7	-0.7	-0.7	-3.3
Education, Training, Employment and Social Services (500):							
BA	13.2	15.8	16.3	16.3	16.4	17.1	81.9
O	12.3	16.3	16.3	16	16	16.5	81.1
Health (550):							
BA	125.6	134.8	144.1	155.5	169.1	184.7	788.2
O	123.4	133.2	144.1	155.9	169.8	184.6	787.6
Medicare (570):							
BA	196.5	212.6	218.5	236.6	252.2	275.6	1195.5
O	196.4	212.9	218.5	236.4	252.4	275.6	1195.8
Income Security (600):							
BA	208.5	217	224.7	233.6	243.1	255.2	1173.6
O	205.6	213	222.1	231.2	240.9	253.4	1160.6
Social Security (650):							
BA	401.8	419.4	439.6	460.3	482.4	506.6	2308.3
O	401.8	419.4	439.6	460.3	482.4	506.6	2308.3
On-budget:							
BA	11.5	9.7	11.5	12.2	13	13.8	60.2
O	11.5	9.7	11.5	12.2	13	13.8	60.2
Off-budget:							
BA	390.3	409.7	428.1	448	469.5	492.7	2248
O	390.3	409.7	428.1	448	469.5	492.7	2248
Veterans Benefits and Services (700):							
BA	25.1	25.6	26.4	27.8	28.6	31.5	139.9
O	24.8	25.4	26.3	27.7	28.5	31.3	139.2
Administration of Justice (750):							
BA	0.7	1.1	0.7	0.6	0.6	0.5	3.5
O	0.8	0.9	0.8	0.7	0.5	0.4	3.3
General Government (800):							

HOUSE-PASSED BUDGET RESOLUTION MANDATORY SPENDING—Continued

[In billions of dollars]

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2001–05
BA	1.3	1.2	1.2	1.1	1.1	1.2	5.8
O	1.6	1.2	1.2	1.1	1.3	1.1	5.9
Net Interest (900):							
BA	224.5	218.9	210	194.9	179.3	162.5	965.6
O	224.5	218.9	210	194.9	179.3	162.5	965.6
On-budget:							
BA	284.6	288.5	290	285.7	280.9	275.4	1420.5
O	284.6	288.5	290	285.7	280.9	275.4	1420.5
Off-budget:							
BA	-60	-69.5	-80.1	-90.8	-101.6	-112.9	-454.9
O	-60	-69.5	-80.1	-90.8	-101.6	-112.9	-454.9
Allowances (920):							
BA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
O	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):							
BA	-41.8	-46.7	-50.3	-50.2	-48.2	-50.1	-245.5
O	-41.8	-46.7	-50.3	-50.2	-48.2	-50.1	-245.5
On-budget:							
BA	-34.1	-38.4	-41.3	-40.7	-38.1	-39.2	-197.7
O	-34.1	-38.4	-41.3	-40.7	-38.1	-39.2	-197.7
Off-budget:							
BA	-7.7	-8.3	-8.9	-9.5	-10.1	-10.9	-47.7
O	-7.7	-8.3	-8.9	-9.5	-10.1	-10.9	-47.7

FUNCTION SUMMARY—SENATE-PASSED RESOLUTION

[In billions of dollars]

Function	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2001–05
50:							
BA	291.6	309.8	309.1	315.5	323.2	331.5	1589.2
OT	288.1	296.7	303.1	309.6	317.7	328.1	1555.1
Discretionary:							
BA	292.6	310.8	310	316.4	324	332.3	1593.6
OT	289.1	297.7	304	310.5	318.5	328.9	1559.5
Mandatory:							
BA	-1	-1	-0.9	-0.9	-0.8	-0.8	-4.4
OT	-1	-1	-0.9	-0.9	-0.8	-0.8	-4.4
150:							
BA	22	20.1	20.9	21.4	21.9	22.6	107
OT	16	18.6	17.9	17.6	17.7	17.9	89.8
Discretionary:							
BA	24.2	20.4	20.9	21.4	21.9	22.5	107
OT	20.6	22.6	21.7	21.2	21.2	21.3	108
Mandatory:							
BA	-2.2	-0.2	0	0	0	0.2	0
OT	-4.6	-4	-3.8	-3.7	-3.5	-3.4	-18.3
250:							
BA	19.3	19.7	19.9	19.8	20.1	20.3	99.8
OT	18.4	19.2	19.6	19.5	19.7	19.9	97.9
Discretionary:							
BA	19.2	19.6	19.8	19.8	20	20.3	99.6
OT	18.4	19.2	19.5	19.5	19.6	19.9	97.7
Mandatory:							
BA	0.1	0.1	0	0	0	0	0.2
OT	0.1	0.1	0.1	0	0	0	0.3
270:							
BA	1.1	1.5	-0.3	1.2	1.2	1.2	4.9
OT	-0.6	0.2	-1.4	0	-0.1	-0.1	-1.4
Discretionary:							
BA	2.6	3.1	1.7	3.1	3.1	3.1	14
OT	3	3.1	1.8	3.1	3.1	3.1	14.3
Mandatory:							
BA	-1.5	-1.6	-1.9	-1.9	-1.8	-1.9	-9.2
OT	-3.6	-2.9	-3.1	-3.2	-3.2	-3.2	-15.7
300:							
BA	24.5	24.9	25	25	25.1	25.1	125.1
OT	24.2	24.9	25	25.2	25.1	24.9	125.1
Discretionary:							
BA	24.2	24.1	24.1	24.1	24.1	24.1	120.3
OT	23.8	24	24.2	24.2	24.1	24	120.6
Mandatory:							
BA	0.3	0.9	1	1	1	1	4.8
OT	0.5	0.9	0.8	1	1	0.9	4.5
350:							
BA	35.3	20.9	19	18	17.4	16.1	91.3
OT	33.9	18.8	17.2	16.4	15.9	14.6	82.9
Discretionary:							
BA	4.5	4.5	4.6	4.6	4.7	4.7	23.1
OT	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.6	4.6	22.8
Mandatory:							
BA	30.7	16.4	14.4	13.4	12.7	11.4	68.2
OT	29.3	14.3	12.8	11.8	11.3	10	60.1
370:							
BA	8.6	6.7	8.9	10.2	13.4	13.4	52.6
OT	4.1	2.6	5.2	5.5	8.4	9.3	30.9
Discretionary:							
BA	7	2.5	3	3	2.9	2.9	14.3
OT	7.3	2.8	2.9	2.9	2.8	2.7	14.2
Mandatory:							
BA	1.6	4.2	5.9	7.2	10.5	10.5	38.2
OT	-3.2	-0.3	2.3	2.5	5.6	6.6	16.8
370 on-budget:							
BA	7.6	6.1	8.6	9.4	13.4	13.4	50.9
OT	3.1	2	4.9	4.7	8.4	9.3	29.2
Discretionary:							
BA	7	2.5	3	3	2.9	2.9	14.3
OT	7.3	2.8	2.9	2.9	2.8	2.7	14.2
Mandatory:							
BA	0.6	3.6	5.6	6.4	10.5	10.5	36.5
OT	-4.2	-0.9	2	1.7	5.6	6.6	15.1
400:							
BA	54.4	59.5	57.5	59.1	59.1	59.2	294.5
OT	46.7	51.1	53.5	55.5	56.1	56.4	272.7
Discretionary:							
BA	14.5	16.1	16.5	17.1	17.1	17.1	84
OT	44.4	49.1	51.8	53.6	54.3	54.7	263.4
Mandatory:							

FUNCTION SUMMARY—SENATE-PASSED RESOLUTION—Continued

[In billions of dollars]

Function	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2001–05
BA	39.9	43.5	41.1	42	42	42	210.5
OT	2.3	2.1	1.7	1.9	1.9	1.8	9.3
450:							
BA	11.3	9.3	8.8	8.7	8.7	8.7	44.2
OT	10.7	10.4	9.9	8.8	8.3	7.9	45.3
Discretionary:							
BA	11.5	9.2	8.8	8.7	8.8	8.8	44.3
OT	11.5	11.1	10.7	9.8	9.3	9	49.9
Mandatory:							
BA	–0.2	0	0	–0.1	–0.1	0	–0.2
OT	–0.7	–0.7	–0.8	–1	–1	–1.1	–4.6
500:							
BA	57.7	75.6	76.4	77.3	78.4	79.8	387.5
OT	61.9	68.8	73.2	76.1	77.4	78.7	374.1
Discretionary:							
BA	44.5	57.4	59.8	60.2	60.9	61.6	300
OT	49.6	52.3	56.5	59.3	60.3	61	289.5
Mandatory:							
BA	13.2	18.2	16.6	17	17.5	18.2	87.5
OT	12.3	16.5	16.6	16.7	17.1	17.7	84.6
550:							
BA	159.2	170.8	178.9	191	205.2	221.5	967.3
OT	153.5	167.4	177.8	190.3	204.8	220.3	960.7
Discretionary:							
BA	33.6	36	34.8	35.5	36.1	36.8	179.2
OT	30.1	34.3	33.8	34.5	35.1	35.7	173.4
Mandatory:							
BA	125.6	134.8	144.1	155.5	169.1	184.7	788.1
OT	123.4	133.1	144	155.8	169.7	184.6	787.3
570:							
BA	199.6	218.8	228.6	249.8	265.3	288.7	1251.2
OT	199.5	219	228.6	249.5	265.5	288.7	1251.4
Discretionary:							
BA	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.1	15.6
OT	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.1	15.5
Mandatory:							
BA	196.5	215.6	225.5	246.6	262.2	285.6	1235.6
OT	196.4	215.9	225.5	246.4	262.4	285.6	1235.8
600:							
BA	238.9	253.2	264.8	274.8	284.9	297.7	1375.5
OT	248.1	255.4	267.3	278.5	288.4	301.2	1390.7
Discretionary:							
BA	30.4	35.4	38	39.1	39.7	40.3	192.5
OT	42.5	42.1	43	45	45.4	45.7	221.1
Mandatory:							
BA	208.5	217.8	226.8	235.7	245.2	257.4	1182.9
OT	205.6	213.4	224.2	233.5	243	255.5	1169.5
650:							
BA	405	422.8	443.1	463.8	486	510.2	2325.9
OT	405	422.8	443.1	463.8	486	510.1	2325.7
Discretionary:							
BA	3.2	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.6	3.6	17.6
OT	3.2	3.4	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.6	17.5
Mandatory:							
BA	401.8	419.4	439.6	460.3	482.4	506.6	2308.3
OT	401.8	419.4	439.6	460.3	482.4	506.6	2308.3
650 on-budget:							
BA	11.5	9.7	11.6	12.3	13	13.8	60.4
OT	11.5	9.7	11.6	12.3	13	13.8	60.4
Discretionary:							
BA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.1
OT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.1
Mandatory:							
BA	11.5	9.7	11.5	12.2	13	13.8	60.3
OT	11.5	9.7	11.5	12.2	13	13.8	60.3
700:							
BA	46	48.6	49.3	51.3	52.6	56	257.9
OT	45.1	48.1	49.2	51	52.3	55.7	256.3
Discretionary:							
BA	20.9	22.9	22.9	23.8	24.3	24.9	118.9
OT	20.4	22.7	22.9	23.6	24.2	24.7	118
Mandatory:							
BA	25.1	25.6	26.4	27.5	28.3	31.1	138.9
OT	24.8	25.4	26.3	27.4	28.2	31	138.3
750:							
BA	27.4	28.2	28.5	29.2	31.3	32.1	149.3
OT	28	28.3	28.8	29.2	31	31.9	149.2
Discretionary:							
BA	26.6	27.1	27.8	28.5	29.2	29.9	142.6
OT	27.2	27.5	27.9	28.5	29.1	29.8	142.7
Mandatory:							
BA	0.7	1.1	0.7	0.6	2.1	2.2	6.7
OT	0.8	0.9	0.8	0.7	2	2.1	6.5
800:							
BA	13.7	14.4	13.6	13.6	13.6	13.6	68.8
OT	14.7	14.3	13.9	13.8	13.9	13.6	69.4
Discretionary:							
BA	12.4	13.2	12.4	12.4	12.4	12.4	62.9
OT	13.2	13.1	12.7	12.6	12.6	12.5	63.5
Mandatory:							
BA	1.3	1.2	1.2	1.1	1.1	1.2	5.9
OT	1.6	1.2	1.2	1.1	1.3	1.1	6
900:							
BA	224.7	219.5	211	197	182.4	166.9	976.8
OT	224.7	219.5	211	197	182.4	166.9	976.8
Discretionary:							
BA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mandatory:							
BA	224.7	219.5	211	197	182.4	166.9	976.8
OT	224.7	219.5	211	197	182.4	166.9	976.8
900 on-budget:							
BA	284.7	289	291.1	287.8	284	279.8	1431.7
OT	284.7	289	291.1	287.8	284	279.8	1431.7
Discretionary:							
BA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mandatory:							
BA	284.7	289	291.1	287.8	284	279.8	1431.7
OT	284.7	289	291.1	287.8	284	279.8	1431.7

FUNCTION SUMMARY—SENATE-PASSED RESOLUTION—Continued

[In billions of dollars]

Function	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2001–05
920:							
BA	0	–6	–0.5	–0.5	–0.5	–0.5	–8
OT	0	–5.6	–1.8	–5.4	–7.3	–6.6	–26.6
Discretionary:							
BA	0	–6	–0.5	–0.5	–0.5	–0.5	–8
OT	0	–5.6	–1.8	–5.4	–7.3	–6.6	–26.6
Mandatory:							
BA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
950:							
BA	–42	–46.6	–50.9	–50.8	–48.5	–51.6	–248.3
OT	–42	–46.6	–50.9	–50.8	–48.5	–51.6	–248.3
Discretionary:							
BA	–0.2	0.1	–0.6	–0.6	–0.3	–1.5	–2.9
OT	–0.2	0.1	–0.6	–0.6	–0.3	–1.5	–2.9
Mandatory:							
BA	–41.8	–46.7	–50.3	–50.2	–48.2	–50.1	–245.5
OT	–41.8	–46.7	–50.3	–50.2	–48.2	–50.1	–245.5
950 on-budget:							
BA	–34.3	–38.4	–41.9	–41.3	–38.4	–40.7	–200.6
OT	–34.3	–38.4	–41.9	–41.3	–38.4	–40.7	–200.6
Discretionary:							
BA	–0.2	0.1	–0.6	–0.6	–0.3	–1.5	–2.9
OT	–0.2	0.1	–0.6	–0.6	–0.3	–1.5	–2.9
Mandatory:							
BA	–34.1	–38.4	–41.3	–40.7	–38.1	–39.2	–197.8
OT	–34.1	–38.4	–41.3	–40.7	–38.1	–39.2	–197.8
Total:							
BA	1798	1871.8	1911.8	1975.2	2040.8	2112.6	9912.1
OT	1780.1	1833.9	1890.1	1951	2014.8	2087.8	9777.7
Discretionary ¹ :							
BA	574.8	603.1	610.7	623.2	635.2	646.5	3118.7
OT	611.7	627	642.1	653.7	663.1	676.1	3262.1
Mandatory:							
BA	1223.2	1268.7	1301.1	1352	1405.5	1466.1	6793.4
OT	1168.5	1206.9	1248	1297.4	1351.6	1411.7	6515.6
Total on-budget:							
BA	1471.3	1535.9	1569	1623.2	1679.5	1740	8147.5
OT	1453.4	1498.1	1547.3	1599	1653.5	1715.3	8013.2
Discretionary:							
BA	571.6	599.6	607.2	619.7	631.7	642.9	3101.2
OT	608.5	623.6	638.7	650.2	659.6	672.6	3244.7
Mandatory:							
BA	899.7	936.2	961.7	1003.5	1047.8	1097.1	5046.4
OT	844.9	874.4	908.6	948.8	993.9	1042.7	4768.5
Revenues	1944.3	2003.3	2072	2146.6	2225.6	2318.6	10766.2
Revenues on-budget	1464.6	1501.8	1547.1	1599.4	1655.7	1721.3	8025.4
Surplus	164.1	169.4	181.9	195.5	210.9	230.8	988.5
On-budget	11.2	3.7	–0.2	0.4	2.2	6	12.1
Off-budget	152.9	165.7	182	195.2	208.7	224.8	976.4

¹ Discretionary spending in this summary reflects the levels that will apply once new discretionary limits are enacted.

CONFERENCE REPORT FISCAL YEAR 2001 BUDGET RESOLUTION TOTAL SPENDING AND REVENUES

[In billions of dollars]

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2001–2005
SUMMARY							
Total Spending:							
BA	1802	1869	1910.1	1970.7	2035	2108.7	9893.5
O	1783.8	1834.7	1889.4	1947.4	2010.3	2084.8	9766.6
On-Budget:							
BA	1471.4	1528.5	1563	1614.7	1670	1733.1	8109.3
O	1453.1	1494.3	1542.3	1591.4	1645.4	1709.2	7982.6
Off-Budget:							
BA	330.6	340.5	347.1	356	365	375.6	1784.2
O	330.7	340.4	347.1	356	364.9	375.6	1784
Revenues:							
Total	1945.1	2004.7	2072.9	2145.8	2222.7	2317.1	10763.2
On-Budget	1465.5	1503.2	1548	1598.6	1652.8	1719.8	8022.4
Off-Budget	479.6	501.5	524.9	547.2	569.9	597.3	2740.8
Surplus/Deficit (–):							
Total	161.3	170	183.5	198.4	212.4	232.3	996.6
On-Budget	12.4	8.9	5.7	7.2	7.4	10.6	39.8
Off-Budget	148.9	161.1	177.8	191.2	205	221.7	956.8
Debt Held by the Public (end of year)	3470.2	3313.2	3135.1	2948.3	2747	2524.2	NA
Debt Subject to Limit (end of year)	5640.2	5723.7	5814.7	5914.4	6008.8	6098	NA
BY FUNCTION							
National Defense (050):							
BA	291.6	309.9	309.2	315.6	323.4	331.7	1589.8
O	288.1	296.7	303.2	309.8	317.9	328.3	1555.9
International Affairs (150):							
BA	22	19.8	20.1	20.1	20.1	20.6	100.7
O	16	18.3	17.8	16.9	16.5	16.4	85.9
General Science, Space, and Technology (250):							
BA	19.3	20.3	20.4	20.6	20.8	21	103.1
O	18.4	19.4	20	20	20.2	20.5	100.1
Energy (270):							
BA	1.1	1.3	0.2	0.9	0.8	0.8	4
O	–0.6	0	–0.9	–0.4	–0.5	–0.5	–2.3
Natural Resources and Environment (300):							
BA	24.5	25.1	25.2	25.2	25.3	25.3	126.1
O	24.2	25	25.2	25.3	25.2	25.1	125.8
Agriculture (350):							
BA	35.3	20.8	18.5	17.6	17	15.8	89.7
O	33.9	18.7	16.8	16	15.5	14.2	81.2
Commerce and Housing Credit (370):							
BA	8.6	6.8	9	10.2	13.5	13.4	52.9
O	4.1	2.8	5.2	5.5	8.5	9.5	31.5
On-budget:							
BA	7.6	6.2	8.7	9.4	13.5	13.4	51.2
O	3.1	2.2	4.9	4.7	8.5	9.5	29.8
Off-budget:							
BA	1	0.6	0.3	0.8	0	0	1.7
O	1	0.6	0.3	0.8	0	0	1.7
Transportation (400):							

CONFERENCE REPORT FISCAL YEAR 2001 BUDGET RESOLUTION TOTAL SPENDING AND REVENUES—Continued

[In billions of dollars]

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2001– 2005
BA	54.4	59.3	57.4	58.9	59	59	293.6
O	46.7	50.5	53	55.2	55.6	55.7	270
Community and Regional Development (450):							
BA	11.3	9.3	8.6	8.6	8.5	8.6	43.6
O	10.7	10.7	9.7	8.6	8.1	7.6	44.7
Education, Training, Employment and Social Services (500):							
BA	57.7	72.6	74.7	75.7	76.7	78.3	378
O	61.9	68.7	72.2	74.2	74.9	75.9	365.9
Health (550):							
BA	159.2	169.6	179.3	191.2	205.4	221.6	967.1
O	153.5	165.9	177.8	190.4	204.9	220.3	959.3
Medicare (570):							
BA	199.6	217.7	226.6	247.8	266.3	292.7	1251.1
O	199.5	218	226.6	247.5	266.5	292.7	1251.3
Income Security (600):							
BA	238.9	252.3	264.2	273.7	283.5	296.1	1369.8
O	248.1	255	266	276.1	286	298.8	1381.9
Social Security (650):							
BA	408.8	427.1	446.7	466.9	488.6	512	2341.3
O	408.9	427	446.7	466.9	488.5	512	2341.1
On-budget:							
BA	11.5	9.7	11.6	12.3	13	13.8	60.4
O	11.5	9.7	11.6	12.3	13	13.8	60.4
Off-budget:							
BA	397.3	417.4	435.1	454.6	475.6	498.2	2280.9
O	397.4	417.3	435.1	454.6	475.5	498.2	2280.7
Veterans Benefits and Services (700):							
BA	46	47.8	49	50.8	52.1	55.4	255.1
O	45.1	47.4	48.9	50.5	51.8	55.1	253.7
Administration of Justice (750):							
BA	27.4	28	28.1	28.5	29	29.5	143.1
O	28	28.1	28.4	28.5	28.7	29.2	142.9
General Government (800):							
BA	13.7	14	13.6	13.6	13.6	13.6	68.4
O	14.7	14.3	13.9	13.8	13.8	13.6	69.4
Net Interest (900):							
BA	224.6	219.4	211.2	197	182.3	166.7	976.6
O	224.6	219.4	211.2	197	182.3	166.7	976.6
On-budget:							
BA	284.6	288.6	290.6	286.9	282.8	278.4	1427.3
O	284.6	288.6	290.6	286.9	282.8	278.4	1427.3
Off-budget:							
BA	–60	–69.2	–79.4	–89.9	–100.5	–111.7	–450.7
O	–60	–69.2	–79.4	–89.9	–100.5	–111.7	–450.7
Allowances (920):							
BA	0	–5.5	–1.7	–2	–2.7	–3.3	–15.2
O	0	–4.6	–2.1	–4.2	–5.9	–6.2	–23
Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):							
BA	–42	–46.6	–50.2	–50.2	–48.2	–50.1	–245.3
O	–42	–46.6	–50.2	–50.2	–48.2	–50.1	–245.3
On-budget:							
BA	–34.3	–38.3	–41.3	–40.7	–38.1	–39.2	–197.6
O	–34.3	–38.3	–41.3	–40.7	–38.1	–39.2	–197.6
Off-budget:							
BA	–7.7	–8.3	–8.9	–9.5	–10.1	–10.9	–47.7
O	–7.7	–8.3	–8.9	–9.5	–10.1	–10.9	–47.7

Note.—Figures assume discretionary levels that will apply once new spending limits are enacted.

CONFERENCE REPORT FISCAL YEAR 2001 BUDGET RESOLUTION DISCRETIONARY SPENDING

[In billions of dollars]

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2001– 2005
SUMMARY							
Total Discretionary Spending:							
BA	574.8	600.2	608.6	619.1	629	640.2	3097.1
O	611.8	625.2	640.8	650.5	658.4	670.3	3245.2
Defense:							
BA	292.6	310.8	310.1	316.4	324.1	332.4	1593.8
O	289.1	297.7	304.1	310.6	318.6	328.9	1559.9
Nondefense:							
BA	282.2	289.4	298.5	302.7	304.9	307.8	1503.3
O	322.7	327.5	336.7	339.9	339.8	341.4	1685.3
BY FUNCTION							
National Defense (050):							
BA	292.6	310.8	310.1	316.4	324.1	332.4	1593.8
O	289.1	297.7	304.1	310.6	318.6	328.9	1559.9
International Affairs (150):							
BA	24.2	20	20.1	20.1	20.1	20.4	100.7
O	20.6	22.3	21.6	20.6	20	19.7	104.2
General Science, Space, and Technology (250):							
BA	19.2	20.2	20.4	20.6	20.8	21	103
O	18.4	19.4	19.9	20	20.2	20.4	99.9
Energy (270):							
BA	2.6	3	2.1	2.7	2.6	2.7	13.1
O	3	3	2.2	2.8	2.7	2.7	13.4
Natural Resources and Environment (300):							
BA	24.2	24.2	24.2	24.3	24.3	24.4	121.4
O	23.8	24.1	24.3	24.4	24.3	24.2	121.3
Agriculture (350):							
BA	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.6	4.6	4.6	22.8
O	4.6	4.5	4.4	4.5	4.5	4.5	22.4
Commerce and Housing and Credit (370):							
BA	7	2.6	3.1	3.1	3	3	14.8
O	7.3	3	3	3	2.9	2.9	14.8
On-budget:							
BA	7	2.6	3.1	3.1	3	3	14.8
O	7.3	3	3	3	2.9	2.9	14.8
Off-budget:							
BA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
O	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Transportation (400):							
BA	14.5	15.8	16.4	17	17	17	83.2
O	44.4	48.5	51.3	53.2	53.7	54	260.7
Community and Regional Development (450):							
BA	11.5	9.2	8.7	8.6	8.6	8.6	43.7

CONFERENCE REPORT FISCAL YEAR 2001 BUDGET RESOLUTION DISCRETIONARY SPENDING—Continued

[In billions of dollars]

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2001– 2005
0	11.5	11.4	10.5	9.6	9.1	8.7	49.3
Education, Training, Employment and Social Services (500):							
BA	44.5	56.8	58.4	59.1	60	60.8	295.1
0	49.6	52.3	55.9	57.9	58.6	59	283.7
Health (550):							
BA	33.6	34.8	35.2	35.7	36.3	36.9	178.9
0	30.1	32.8	33.8	34.6	35.2	35.7	172.1
Medicare (570):							
BA	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.1	15.5
0	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.1	15.5
Income Security (600):							
BA	30.4	35.3	38.2	38.8	39.2	39.6	191.1
0	42.5	42.1	42.7	43.6	43.8	44.1	216.3
Social Security (650):							
BA	3.2	3.4	3.4	3.5	3.6	3.6	17.5
0	3.2	3.3	3.4	3.4	3.5	3.6	17.2
On-budget:							
BA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Off-budget:							
BA	3.2	3.4	3.4	3.5	3.6	3.6	17.5
0	3.2	3.3	3.4	3.4	3.5	3.6	17.2
Veterans Benefits and Services (700):							
BA	20.9	22.1	22.5	23.2	23.6	24.1	115.5
0	20.4	21.9	22.5	23	23.4	23.9	114.7
Administration of Justice (750):							
BA	26.6	26.9	27.5	27.9	28.4	28.9	139.6
0	27.2	27.2	27.5	27.8	28.2	28.7	139.4
General Government (800):							
BA	12.4	12.8	12.4	12.4	12.4	12.4	62.4
0	13.2	13	12.7	12.6	12.5	12.4	63.2
Allowances (920):							
BA	0	–5.5	–1.7	–2	–2.7	–3.3	–15.2
0	0	–4.6	–2.1	–4.2	–5.9	–6.2	–23
Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):							
BA	–0.2	0.2	0	0	0	0	0.2
0	–0.2	0.2	0	0	0	0	0.2
On-budget:							
BA	–0.2	0.2	0	0	0	0	0.2
0	–0.2	0.2	0	0	0	0	0.2
Off-budget:							
BA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Note.—Figures assume discretionary levels that will apply once new spending limits are enacted.

HOUSE-PASSED BUDGET RESOLUTION TOTAL SPENDING AND REVENUES

[In billions of dollars]

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2001–05
SUMMARY							
Total Spending:							
BA	1,801.8	1,856.6	1,897.2	1,952.4	2,011.1	2,081.2	9,798.5
0	1,784	1,823.2	1,876.3	1,930.3	1,988.2	2,058.2	9,676.2
On-Budget:							
BA	1,478.3	1,524.1	1,557.8	1,603.9	1,653.4	1,712.2	8,051.4
0	1,460.5	1,490.7	1,536.9	1,581.8	1,630.5	1,689.2	7,929.1
Off-Budget:							
BA	323.5	332.5	339.4	348.5	357.7	369	1,747.1
0	323.5	332.5	339.4	348.5	357.7	369	1,747.1
Revenues:							
Total	1,945.1	2,006.3	2,074.3	2,145.7	2,220.5	2,316.4	10,763.2
On-Budget	1,465.5	1,504.8	1,549.4	1,598.5	1,650.6	1,719.1	8,022.4
Off-Budget	479.6	501.5	524.9	547.2	569.9	597.3	2,740.8
Surplus/Deficit (-):							
Total	161.1	183.1	198	215.4	232.3	258.2	1,087
On-Budget	5	14.1	12.5	16.7	20.1	29.9	93.3
Off-Budget	156.1	169	185.5	198.7	212.2	228.3	993.7
Debt Held by the Public (end of year)	3,470.3	3,300	3,107.7	2,903.9	2,682.5	2,433.9	NA
Debt Subject to Limit (end of year)	5,640.3	5,710.6	5,787.3	5,869.9	5,944.3	6,007.8	NA
BY FUNCTION							
National Defense (050):							
BA	288.9	306.3	309.3	315.6	323.4	331.7	1,586.3
0	282.5	297.6	302	309.4	317.6	328.1	1,554.7
International Affairs (150):							
BA	20.1	19.5	19.3	18.8	18.3	18.5	94.4
0	15.5	17.3	17.2	16.1	15.2	14.8	80.6
General Science, Space, and Technology (250):							
BA	19.3	20.3	20.4	20.6	20.8	21	103.1
0	18.5	19.4	20	20	20.2	20.5	100.1
Energy (270):							
BA	1.1	1.2	0.7	0.5	0.4	0.3	3.1
0	–0.6	–0.1	–0.4	–0.7	–0.9	–0.9	–3
Natural Resources and Environment (300):							
BA	24.3	25	25.1	25.2	25.3	25.4	126
0	24.2	24.8	25.1	25.2	25.2	25.1	125.4
Agriculture (350):							
BA	35.7	19.1	18.5	17.6	17	15.8	88
0	34.3	16.9	16.7	15.9	15.5	14.2	79.2
Commerce and Housing Credit (370):							
BA	8.5	6.9	9	10.3	13.6	13.5	53.3
0	4.1	2.9	5.3	5.5	8.7	9.6	32
On-budget:							
BA	7.5	6.3	8.7	9.5	13.6	13.5	51.6
0	3.1	2.3	5	4.7	8.7	9.6	30.3
Off-budget:							
BA	1	0.6	0.3	0.8	0	0	1.7
0	1	0.6	0.3	0.8	0	0	1.7
Transportation (400):							
BA	54.3	59.2	57.4	58.8	58.8	58.8	293
0	46.6	50.3	52.5	54.8	55.1	55.1	267.8
Community and Regional Development (450):							
BA	11.2	9.1	8.5	8.4	8.4	8.5	42.9
0	10.8	11.1	9.7	8.8	8.3	7.8	45.7
Education, Training, Employment and Social Services (500):							
BA	57.7	72.6	74	75	76.1	77.8	375.5
0	61.4	69.2	72.1	73.2	73.5	74.2	362.2

HOUSE-PASSED BUDGET RESOLUTION TOTAL SPENDING AND REVENUES—Continued

[In billions of dollars]

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2001–05
Health (550):							
BA	159.3	169.7	179.6	191.5	205.6	221.7	968.1
O	152.3	167.1	177.9	190.6	205	220.3	960.9
Medicare (570):							
BA	199.6	215.7	221.6	239.7	255.3	278.7	1,211
O	199.5	216	221.6	239.5	255.5	278.7	1,211.3
Income Security (600):							
BA	238.4	252.2	263	272.1	281.7	294	1,363
O	248	254.9	264.3	273.4	283.2	295.9	1,371.7
Social Security (650):							
BA	405	422.8	443	463.7	486.1	510.1	2,325.7
O	405	422.7	443	463.6	486	510.1	2,325.4
On-budget:							
BA	14.7	13.1	14.9	15.7	16.6	17.4	77.7
O	14.7	13	14.9	15.6	16.5	17.4	77.4
Off-budget:							
BA	390.3	409.7	428.1	448	469.5	492.7	2,248
O	390.3	409.7	428.1	448	469.5	492.7	2,248
Veterans Benefits and Services (700):							
BA	46	47.8	49	50.8	52	55.3	254.9
O	45.2	47.4	48.9	50.6	51.7	54.9	253.5
Administration of Justice (750):							
BA	27.3	28	27.8	27.9	28.2	28.4	140.3
O	28	28	28	27.9	27.9	28.1	139.9
General Government (800):							
BA	13.9	13.6	13.6	13.5	13.5	13.6	67.8
O	14.7	14.2	13.9	13.7	13.7	13.5	69
Net Interest (900):							
BA	224.6	219	209.9	194.9	179.3	162.5	965.6
O	224.6	219	209.9	194.9	179.3	162.5	965.6
On-budget:							
BA	284.6	288.5	290	285.7	280.9	275.4	1,420.5
O	284.6	288.5	290	285.7	280.9	275.4	1,420.5
Off-budget:							
BA	–60	–69.5	–80.1	–90.8	–101.6	–112.9	–454.9
O	–60	–69.5	–80.1	–90.8	–101.6	–112.9	–454.9
Allowances (920):							
BA	8.5	–4.7	–2.1	–2.6	–4.3	–4.4	–18.1
O	11.5	–8.7	–1	–2.2	–4	–4.3	–20.2
Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):							
BA	–41.8	–46.7	–50.2	–50.2	–48.2	–50.1	–245.4
O	–41.8	–46.7	–50.2	–50.2	–48.2	–50.1	–245.4
On-budget:							
BA	–34.1	–38.4	–41.3	–40.7	–38.1	–39.2	–197.7
O	–34.1	–38.4	–41.3	–40.7	–38.1	–39.2	–197.7
Off-budget:							
BA	–7.7	–8.3	–8.9	–9.5	–10.1	–10.9	–47.7
O	–7.7	–8.3	–8.9	–9.5	–10.1	–10.9	–47.7

HOUSE PASSED BUDGET RESOLUTION DISCRETIONARY SPENDING

[In billions of dollars]

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2001–05
SUMMARY							
Total Discretionary Spending:							
BA	578.2	596.5	607.3	615.6	623.6	634.4	3077.4
O	615.2	622.1	639.2	648	654.3	665.5	3229.1
Defense:							
BA	289.9	307.3	310.2	316.5	324.2	332.5	1,590.7
O	283.5	298.6	302.9	310.3	318.4	328.9	1,559.1
Nondefense:							
BA	288.3	289.2	297.1	299.1	299.4	301.9	1,486.7
O	331.7	323.5	336.3	337.7	335.9	336.6	1,670
BY FUNCTION							
National Defense (050):							
BA	289.9	307.3	310.2	316.5	324.2	332.5	1,590.7
O	283.5	298.6	302.9	310.3	318.4	328.9	1,559.1
International Affairs (150):							
BA	22.3	19.7	19.3	18.8	18.3	18.3	94.4
O	20.1	21.3	21	19.8	18.7	18.2	99
General Science, Space, and Technology (250):							
BA	19.2	20.2	20.4	20.6	20.8	21	103
O	18.4	19.4	19.9	20	20.2	20.4	99.8
Energy (270):							
BA	2.6	2.8	2.6	2.4	2.2	2.2	12.2
O	3	2.8	2.7	2.5	2.3	2.3	12.6
Natural Resources and Environment (300):							
BA	24	24.3	24.4	24.5	24.6	24.7	122.5
O	23.7	24.1	24.4	24.5	24.5	24.5	122
Agriculture (350):							
BA	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	22.5
O	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.4	22
Commerce and Housing Credit (370):							
BA	6.9	2.7	3.1	3.1	3.1	3	15
O	7.3	3.2	3	3	3.1	3	15.3
On-budget:							
BA	6.9	2.7	3.1	3.1	3.1	3	15
O	7.3	3.2	3	3	3.1	3	15.3
Off-budget:							
BA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
O	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Transportation (400):							
BA	14.4	15.7	16.3	16.8	16.8	16.8	82.4
O	44.3	48.2	50.8	52.9	53.2	53.3	258.4
Community and Regional Development (450):							
BA	11.4	9.1	8.5	8.5	8.5	8.5	43.1
O	11.5	11.7	10.3	9.5	9	8.5	49
Education, Training, Employment and Social Services (500):							
BA	44.5	56.8	57.7	58.7	59.7	60.7	293.6
O	49.1	52.9	55.8	57.2	57.5	57.7	281.1
Health (550):							
BA	33.7	34.9	35.5	36	36.5	37	179.9
O	28.9	33.9	33.8	34.7	35.2	35.7	173.3
Medicare (570):							
BA	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.1	15.5
O	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.1	15.5

April 12, 2000

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

HOUSE PASSED BUDGET RESOLUTION DISCRETIONARY SPENDING—Continued

[In billions of dollars]

H2223

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2001–05
Income Security (600):							
BA	29.9	35.2	38.3	38.5	38.6	38.8	189.4
O	42.4	41.9	42.2	42.2	42.3	42.5	211.1
Social Security (650):							
BA	3.2	3.4	3.4	3.5	3.6	3.6	17.5
O	3.2	3.3	3.4	3.4	3.5	3.6	17.2
On-budget:							
BA	3.2	3.4	3.4	3.5	3.6	3.6	17.5
O	3.2	3.3	3.4	3.4	3.5	3.6	17.2
Off-budget:							
BA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
O	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Veterans Benefits and Services (700):							
BA	20.9	22.2	22.6	23	23.4	23.8	115
O	20.4	22	22.6	22.9	23.2	23.6	114.3
Administration of Justice (750):							
BA	26.6	26.9	27.1	27.3	27.6	27.9	136.8
O	27.2	27.1	27.2	27.2	27.4	27.7	136.6
General Government (800):							
BA	12.6	12.4	12.4	12.4	12.4	12.4	62
O	13.1	13	12.7	12.6	12.4	12.4	63.1
Allowances (920) ¹ :							
BA	8.5	-4.7	-2.1	-2.6	-4.3	-4.4	-18.1
O	11.5	-8.7	-1	-2.2	-4	-4.3	-20.3

¹ Includes the Administration's supplemental request.

CONFERENCE REPORT FISCAL YEAR 2001 BUDGET RESOLUTION MANDATORY SPENDING

[In billions of dollars]

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2001–05
SUMMARY							
Total Mandatory Spending:							
BA	1,227.1	1,269	1,301.6	1,351.4	1,406.1	1,468.5	6,796.6
O	1,172.5	1,210	1,248.7	1,296.7	1,352	1,414.1	6,521.5
On-budget:							
BA	899.6	931.9	957.9	998.9	1,044.6	1,096.5	5,029.8
O	845	872.9	905	944.2	990.5	1,042.1	4,754.7
Off-budget:							
BA	327.5	337.1	343.7	352.5	361.5	372	1,766.8
O	327.5	337.1	343.7	352.5	361.5	372	1,766.8
BY FUNCTION							
National Defense (050):							
BA	-1	-0.9	-0.9	-0.8	-0.7	-0.7	-4
O	-1	-0.9	-0.9	-0.8	-0.7	-0.7	-4
International Affairs (150):							
BA	-2.2	-0.2	0	0	0	0.2	0
O	-4.6	-4	-3.8	-3.7	-3.5	-3.4	-18.4
General Science, Space, and Technology (250):							
BA	0.1	0.1	0	0	0	0	0.1
O	0.1	0.1	0.1	0	0	0	0.2
Energy (270):							
BA	-1.5	-1.6	-1.9	-1.9	-1.8	-1.9	-9.1
O	-3.6	-2.9	-3.1	-3.2	-3.2	-3.2	-15.6
Natural Resources and Environment (300):							
BA	0.3	0.9	0.9	0.9	1	1	4.7
O	0.5	0.9	0.9	1	0.9	0.9	4.6
Agriculture (350):							
BA	30.7	16.3	14	13.1	12.4	11.2	67
O	29.3	14.2	12.4	11.5	11	9.7	58.8
Commerce and Housing Credit (370):							
BA	1.6	4.2	5.9	7.2	10.5	10.5	38.3
O	-3.2	-0.3	2.3	2.5	5.6	6.6	16.7
On-budget:							
BA	0.6	3.6	5.6	6.4	10.5	10.5	36.6
O	-4.2	-0.9	2	1.7	5.6	6.6	15
Off-budget:							
BA	1	0.6	0.3	0.8	0	0	1.7
O	1	0.6	0.3	0.8	0	0	1.7
Transportation (400):							
BA	39.9	43.5	41.1	42	42	42	210.6
O	2.3	2.1	1.7	1.9	1.9	1.8	9.4
Community and Regional Development (450):							
BA	-0.2	0	0	-0.1	-0.1	0	-0.2
O	-0.7	-0.7	-0.8	-1	-1	-1.1	-4.6
Education, Training, Employment and Social Services (500):							
BA	13.2	15.8	16.3	16.5	16.7	17.4	82.7
O	12.3	16.4	16.4	16.2	16.4	16.9	82.3
Health (550):							
BA	125.6	134.8	144.1	155.5	169.1	184.7	788.2
O	123.4	133.2	144	155.9	169.7	184.6	787.4
Medicare (570):							
BA	196.5	214.6	223.5	244.6	263.2	289.6	1,235.5
O	196.4	214.9	223.5	244.4	263.4	289.6	1,235.8
Income Security (600):							
BA	208.5	217	226	234.9	244.4	256.5	1,178.8
O	205.6	213	223.4	232.5	242.2	254.7	1,165.8
Social Security (650):							
BA	405.7	423.7	443.2	463.3	485.1	508.4	2,323.7
O	405.7	423.7	443.2	463.3	485.1	508.4	2,323.7
On-budget:							
BA	11.5	9.7	11.5	12.2	13	13.8	60.2
O	11.5	9.7	11.5	12.2	13	13.8	60.2
Off-budget:							
BA	394.2	414	431.7	451.1	472.1	494.6	2,263.5
O	394.2	414	431.7	451.1	472.1	494.6	2,263.5
Veterans Benefits and Services (700):							
BA	25.1	25.8	26.5	27.7	28.5	31.3	139.8
O	24.8	25.5	26.4	27.6	28.3	31.2	139
Administration of Justice (750):							
BA	0.7	1.1	0.7	0.6	0.6	0.5	3.5
O	0.8	0.9	0.8	0.7	0.5	0.4	3.3
General Government (800):							
BA	1.3	1.2	1.2	1.1	1.1	1.2	5.8
O	1.6	1.2	1.2	1.1	1.3	1.1	5.9
Net Interest (900):							
BA	224.6	219.4	211.2	197	182.3	166.7	976.6

CONFERENCE REPORT FISCAL YEAR 2001 BUDGET RESOLUTION MANDATORY SPENDING—Continued

[In billions of dollars]

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2001–05
0	224.6	219.4	211.2	197	182.3	166.7	976.6
On-budget:							
BA	284.6	288.6	290.6	286.9	282.8	278.4	1,427.3
0	284.6	288.6	290.6	286.9	282.8	278.4	1,427.3
Off-budget:							
BA	-60	-69.2	-79.4	-89.9	-100.5	-111.7	-450.7
0	-60	-69.2	-79.4	-89.9	-100.5	-111.7	-450.7
Allowances (920):							
BA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Undistributed Offsetting:							
BA	-41.8	-46.7	-50.2	-50.2	-48.2	-50.1	-245.4
0	-41.8	-46.7	-50.2	-50.2	-48.2	-50.1	-245.4
Receipts (950):							
BA	-34.1	-38.4	-41.3	-40.7	-38.1	-39.2	-197.7
0	-34.1	-38.4	-41.3	-40.7	-38.1	-39.2	-197.7
Off-budget:							
BA	-7.7	-8.3	-8.9	-9.5	-10.1	-10.9	-47.7
0	-7.7	-8.3	-8.9	-9.5	-10.1	-10.9	-47.7

Note.—Figures assume discretionary levels that will apply once new spending limits are enacted.

BUDGET FUNCTION LEVELS

Pursuant to section 301(a)(3) of the Budget Act, the budget resolution must set appropriate levels for each major functional category based on the 302(a) allocations and the budgetary totals.

The respective levels of the House resolution, the Senate amendment, and the conference report for each major budget function are as follows:

FUNCTION 050: NATIONAL DEFENSE

Major Programs in Function—The National Defense function includes funds to develop, maintain, and equip the military forces of the United States. Roughly 95 percent of the funding in this function goes to Department of Defense—Military activities, including funds for ballistic missile defense. That component also includes pay and benefits for military and civilian personnel; research, development, testing, and evaluation; procurement of weapons systems; military construction and family housing; and operations and maintenance of the defense establishment. The remaining funding in the function goes toward atomic energy defense activities of the Department of Energy, and other defense-related activities.

House Resolution—The House resolution revises the fiscal year 2000 levels to \$288.9 billion in budget authority [BA] and \$282.5 billion in outlays. For fiscal year 2001, it sets forth \$306.3 billion in BA and \$297.6 billion in outlays. Over 5 years, it provides \$1,586.3 billion in BA and \$1,554.7 billion in outlays.

Senate Amendment—The Senate amendment revises the fiscal year 2000 levels to \$291.6 billion in BA and \$288.1 billion in outlays. For fiscal year 2001, it sets forth \$309.8 billion in BA and \$296.7 billion in outlays. Over 5 years, it provides \$1,589.2 billion in BA and \$1,555.1 billion in outlays. These amounts reflect \$4.0 billion in additional resources added to 2001 during the Senate's consideration of S. Con. Res. 101. This addition assumes that no such amount is added to 2000. The total amount also includes \$10 million in BA and outlays in 2001 and \$27.5 million in BA and outlays over 2000–2005. This latter amount was adopted by a vote of 99–0 and was explicitly assumed to supplement the compensation of enlisted personnel in the military who currently receive food stamps.

Conference Agreement—The Conference Agreement revises the fiscal year 2000 levels to \$291.6 billion in BA and \$288.1 billion in outlays. For fiscal year 2001, it sets forth \$309.9 billion in BA and \$296.7 billion in outlays. Over 5 years, it provides \$1,589.8 billion in BA and \$1,555.9 billion in outlays.

The Conference Agreement adopts the assumptions of the Senate amendment with respect to the addition of \$4.0 billion in BA and commensurate outlays. It also adopts the

Senate amendment assumption regarding enlisted military personnel on food stamps.

FUNCTION 150: INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Major Programs in Function—Funds distributed through the International Affairs function provide for international development and humanitarian assistance; international security assistance; the conduct of foreign affairs; foreign information and exchange activities; and international financial programs. The major departments and agencies in this function include the Department of State, the Department of the Treasury, and the Agency for International Development.

House Resolution—The House resolution revises the fiscal year 2000 levels to \$20.1 billion in budget authority [BA] and \$15.5 billion in outlays. For fiscal year 2001, it sets forth \$19.5 billion in BA and \$17.3 billion in outlays. Over 5 years, it provides \$94.4 billion in BA and \$80.6 billion in outlays.

Senate Amendment—The Senate amendment revises the fiscal year 2000 levels to \$22.0 billion in BA and \$16.0 billion in outlays. For fiscal year 2001, it sets forth \$20.1 billion in BA and \$18.6 billion in outlays. Over 5 years, it provides \$107.0 billion in BA and \$89.8 billion in outlays.

Conference Agreement—The Conference Agreement revises the fiscal year 2000 levels to \$22.0 billion in BA and \$16.0 billion in outlays. For fiscal year 2001, it sets forth \$19.8 billion in BA and \$18.3 billion in outlays. Over 5 years, it provides \$100.7 billion in BA and \$85.9 billion in outlays.

FUNCTION 250: GENERAL SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY

Major Programs in Function—The General Science, Space, and Technology function consists of funds in two major categories: general science and basic research, and space flight, research, and supporting activities. The general science component includes the budgets for the National Science Foundation [NSF], and the fundamental science programs of the Department of Energy [DOE]. But the largest component of the function—about two-thirds of its total—is for space flight, research, and supporting activities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration [NASA] (except for NASA's air transportation programs, which are included in Function 400).

House Resolution—The House resolution revises the fiscal year 2000 levels to \$19.3 billion in budget authority [BA] and \$18.5 billion in outlays. For fiscal year 2001, it sets forth \$20.3 billion in BA and \$19.4 billion in outlays. Over 5 years, it provides \$103.1 billion in BA and \$100.1 billion in outlays.

Senate Amendment—The Senate amendment revises the fiscal year 2000 levels to \$19.3 billion in BA and \$18.4 billion in outlays. For fiscal year 2001, it sets forth \$19.7 billion in

BA and \$19.2 billion in outlays. Over 5 years, it provides \$99.8 billion in BA and \$97.9 billion in outlays.

Conference Agreement—The Conference Agreement revises the fiscal year 2000 levels to \$19.3 billion in BA and \$18.4 billion in outlays. For fiscal year 2001, it sets forth \$20.3 billion in BA and \$19.4 billion in outlays. Over 5 years, it provides \$103.1 billion in BA and \$100.1 billion in outlays.

FUNCTION 270: ENERGY

Major Programs in Function—The Energy function reflects the civilian activities in the Department of Energy. Through this function, spending is provided for energy supply and fossil energy R&D programs; rural electricity and telecommunications loans administered through the Department of Agriculture; and electric power generation and transmission programs for the three Power Marketing Administrations. The function also includes the Strategic Petroleum Reserve; energy conservation programs, including the Partnership for the Next Generation of Vehicles; Clean Coal Technology; Nuclear Waste Disposal; and the operations of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

House Resolution—The House resolution revises the fiscal year 2000 levels to \$1.1 billion in budget authority [BA] and –\$0.6 billion in outlays. For fiscal year 2001, the resolution sets forth \$1.2 billion in BA and –\$0.1 billion in outlays. Over 5 years, it provides \$3.1 billion in BA and –\$3.0 billion in outlays.

Senate Amendment—The Senate amendment revises the fiscal year 2000 levels to \$1.1 billion in BA and –\$0.6 billion in outlays. For fiscal year 2001, it sets forth \$1.5 billion in BA and \$0.2 billion in outlays. Over 5 years, it provides \$4.9 billion in BA and –\$1.4 billion in outlays.

Conference Agreement—The Conference Agreement revises the fiscal year 2000 levels to \$1.1 billion in BA and –\$0.6 billion in outlays. For fiscal year 2001, it sets forth \$1.3 billion in BA and \$0 in outlays. Over 5 years, it provides \$4.0 billion in BA and –\$2.3 billion in outlays.

FUNCTION 300: NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT

Major Programs in Function—Funds distributed through the Natural Resources and Environment function are intended to develop, manage, and maintain the Nation's natural resources, and to promote a clean environment. Funding is provided for water resources, conservation and land management, recreational resources, pollution control and abatement, and other natural resources. Major departments and agencies in this function are the Department of the Interior, including the National Park Service, the Bureau of Land Management, the Bureau of

Reclamation, and the Fish and Wildlife Service; certain agencies in the Department of Agriculture, including principally the Forest Service; the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, in the Department of Commerce; the Army Corps of Engineers; and the Environmental Protection Agency.

House Resolution—The House resolution revises the fiscal year 2000 levels to \$24.3 billion in budget authority [BA] and \$24.2 billion in outlays. For fiscal year 2001, it sets forth \$25.0 billion in BA and \$24.8 billion in outlays. Over 5 years, it provides \$126.0 billion in BA and \$125.4 billion in outlays.

Senate Amendment—The Senate amendment revises the fiscal year 2000 levels to \$24.5 billion in BA and \$24.2 billion in outlays. For fiscal year 2001, it sets forth \$24.9 billion in BA and outlays. Over 5 years, it provides \$125.1 billion in BA and outlays.

Conference Agreement—The Conference Agreement revises the fiscal year 2000 levels to \$24.5 billion in BA and \$24.2 billion in outlays. For fiscal year 2001, it sets forth \$25.1 billion in BA and \$25.0 billion in outlays. Over 5 years, it provides \$126.1 billion in BA and \$125.8 billion in outlays.

FUNCTION 350: AGRICULTURE

Major Programs in Function—The Agriculture function includes funds for direct assistance and loans to food and fiber producers, crop insurance, export assistance, market information and inspection services, and agricultural research and services.

House Resolution—The House resolution revises the fiscal year 2000 levels to \$35.7 billion in budget authority [BA] and \$34.3 billion in outlays. For fiscal year 2001, the resolution sets forth \$19.1 billion in BA and \$16.9 billion in outlays. Over 5 years, it provides \$88.0 billion in BA and \$79.2 billion in outlays.

Senate Amendment—The Senate amendment revises the fiscal year 2000 levels to \$35.3 billion in BA and \$33.9 billion in outlays. For fiscal year 2001, it sets forth \$20.9 billion in BA and \$18.8 billion in outlays. Over 5 years, it provides \$91.3 billion in BA and \$82.9 billion in outlays.

Conference Agreement—The Conference Agreement revises the fiscal year 2000 levels to \$35.3 billion in BA and \$33.9 billion in outlays. For fiscal year 2001, it sets forth \$20.8 billion in BA and \$18.7 billion in outlays. Over 5 years, it provides \$89.7 billion in BA and \$81.2 billion in outlays.

FUNCTION 370: COMMERCE AND HOUSING CREDIT

Major Programs in Function—The mortgage credit component of this function includes housing assistance through the Federal Housing Administration [FHA], and rural housing programs of the Department of Agriculture. The function includes spending for deposit insurance activities related to banks, thrifts, and credit unions. Also included is the Commerce Department's National Institute of Standards and Technology, including the Advanced Technology Program; the International Trade Administration; the National Telecommunications and Information Administration; the Bureau of the Census; and the Patent and Trademark Office. Also appearing in this function are independent agencies such as the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, and the Federal Communications Commission. The function also includes net spending for the postal service, but these totals are off budget, and therefore are not reflected in the figures below.

House Resolution—The House resolution revises the fiscal year 2000 on-budget levels to \$7.5 billion in budget authority [BA] and \$3.1 billion in outlays. For fiscal year 2001, the resolution sets forth on-budget levels of \$6.3 billion in BA and \$2.3 billion in outlays. Over 5 years, it provides on-budget amounts of

\$51.6 billion in BA and \$30.3 billion in outlays.

Senate Amendment—The Senate amendment revises the fiscal year 2000 on-budget levels to \$7.6 billion in BA and \$3.1 billion in outlays. For fiscal year 2001, it sets forth on-budget levels of \$6.1 billion in BA and \$2.0 billion in outlays. Over 5 years, it provides on-budget amounts of \$50.9 billion in BA and \$29.2 billion in outlays.

Conference Agreement—The Conference Agreement revises the fiscal year 2000 on-budget levels to \$7.6 billion in BA and \$3.1 billion in outlays. For fiscal year 2001, it sets forth on-budget levels of \$6.2 billion in BA and \$2.2 billion in outlays. Over 5 years, it provides on-budget amounts of \$51.2 billion in BA and \$29.8 billion in outlays.

FUNCTION 400: TRANSPORTATION

Major Programs in Function—This function supports all major Federal transportation programs. About two-thirds of the funding provided here is for ground transportation programs. This includes the Federal-aid highway program, mass transit operating and capital assistance, motor carrier safety, rail transportation through the National Railroad Passenger Corporation [Amtrak], and high-speed rail and rail safety programs. Additional components of this function are air transportation, including the Federal Aviation Administration airport improvement program, the facilities and equipment program, and operations and research; water transportation through the Coast Guard and the Maritime Administration; and other transportation support activities. Funds for air transportation programs under the auspices of NASA are distributed through this function as well.

House Resolution—The House resolution revises the fiscal year 2000 levels to \$54.3 billion in budget authority [BA] and \$46.6 billion in outlays. For fiscal year 2001, it sets forth \$59.2 billion in BA and \$50.3 billion in outlays. Over 5 years, it provides \$293.0 billion in BA and \$267.8 billion in outlays.

Senate Amendment—The Senate amendment revises the fiscal year 2000 levels to \$54.4 billion in BA and \$46.7 billion in outlays. For fiscal year 2001, it sets forth \$59.5 billion in BA and \$51.1 billion in outlays. Over 5 years, it provides \$294.5 billion in BA and \$272.7 billion in outlays.

Conference Agreement—The Conference Agreement revises the fiscal year 2000 levels to \$54.4 billion in BA and \$46.7 billion in outlays. For fiscal year 2001, it sets forth \$59.3 billion in BA and \$50.5 billion in outlays. Over 5 years, it provides \$293.5 billion in BA and \$270.0 billion in outlays.

FUNCTION 450: COMMUNITY AND REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Major Programs in Function—The Community and Regional Development function reflects programs that provide Federal funding for economic and community development in both urban and rural areas. Funding for disaster relief and insurance—including activities of the Federal Emergency Management Agency—also is provided in this function.

House Resolution—The House resolution revises the fiscal year 2000 levels to \$11.2 billion in budget authority [BA] and \$10.8 billion in outlays. For fiscal year 2001, the resolution sets forth \$9.1 billion in BA and \$11.1 billion in outlays. Over 5 years, it provides \$42.9 billion in BA and \$45.7 billion in outlays.

Senate Amendment—The Senate amendment revises the fiscal year 2000 levels to \$11.3 billion in BA and \$10.7 billion in outlays. For fiscal year 2001, it sets forth \$9.3 billion in BA and \$10.4 billion in outlays. Over 5 years, it provides \$44.2 billion in BA and \$45.3 billion in outlays.

Conference Agreement—The Conference Agreement revises the fiscal year 2000 levels

to \$11.3 billion in BA and \$10.7 billion in outlays. For fiscal year 2001, it sets forth \$9.3 billion in BA and \$10.7 billion in outlays. Over 5 years, it provides \$43.6 billion in BA and \$44.7 billion in outlays.

FUNCTION 500: EDUCATION, TRAINING, EMPLOYMENT, AND SOCIAL SERVICES

Major Programs in Function—Forty-five percent of the funding in the Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services function is for Federal programs in elementary, secondary, and vocational education. Also shown here are funds for higher education programs, accounting for about 23 percent of the function's spending; research and general education aids, including the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities; training and employment services; other labor services; and grants to States for general social services and rehabilitation services, such as the Social Services Block Grant and vocational rehabilitation.

House Resolution—The House resolution revises the fiscal year 2000 levels to \$57.7 billion in budget authority [BA] and \$61.4 billion in outlays. For fiscal year 2001, it sets forth \$72.6 billion in BA and \$69.2 billion in outlays. Over 5 years, it provides \$375.5 billion in BA and \$362.2 billion in outlays.

Senate Amendment—The Senate amendment revises the fiscal year 2000 levels to \$57.7 billion in BA and \$61.9 billion in outlays. For fiscal year 2001, it sets forth \$75.6 billion in BA and \$68.8 billion in outlays. Over 5 years, it provides \$387.5 billion in BA and \$374.1 billion in outlays.

Conference Agreement—The Conference Agreement revises the fiscal year 2000 levels to \$57.7 billion in BA and \$61.9 billion in outlays. For fiscal year 2001, it sets forth \$72.6 billion in BA and \$68.7 billion in outlays. Over 5 years, it provides \$378.0 billion in BA and \$365.9 billion in outlays.

FUNCTION 550: HEALTH

Major Programs in Function—The Health function consists of health care services, including Medicaid, the Nation's major program covering medical and long-term care costs for low-income persons; health research and training; and consumer and occupational health and safety. Medicaid represents about 73 percent of the spending in this function.

House Resolution—The House resolution revises the fiscal year 2000 levels to \$159.3 billion in budget authority [BA] and \$152.3 billion in outlays. For fiscal year 2001, the resolution sets forth \$169.7 billion in BA and \$167.1 billion in outlays. Over 5 years, it provides \$968.1 billion in BA and \$960.9 billion in outlays.

Senate Amendment—The Senate amendment revises the fiscal year 2000 levels to \$159.2 billion in BA and \$153.5 billion in outlays. For fiscal year 2001, it sets forth \$170.8 billion in BA and \$167.4 billion in outlays. Over 5 years, it provides \$967.3 billion in BA and \$960.7 billion in outlays.

Conference Agreement—The Conference Agreement revises the fiscal year 2000 levels to \$159.2 billion in BA and \$153.5 billion in outlays. For fiscal year 2001, it sets forth \$169.6 billion in BA and \$165.9 billion in outlays. Over 5 years, it provides \$967.0 billion in BA and \$959.3 billion in outlays.

FUNCTION 570: MEDICARE

Major Programs in Function—This function reflects the Medicare Part A Hospital Insurance [HI] Program, Part B Supplementary Medical Insurance [SMI] Program, and premiums paid by qualified aged and disabled beneficiaries. It includes the "Medicare+Choice" Program, which covers Part A and Part B benefits and allows beneficiaries to choose certain private health insurance plans. Medicare+Choice plans may

include health maintenance organizations, preferred provider organizations, provider-sponsored organizations, medical savings accounts, and private fee-for-service plans. These plans may add benefits such as outpatient prescription drug coverage, and may cover premiums, copayments, and deductibles required by the traditional Medicare Program.

House Resolution.—The House resolution revises the fiscal year 2000 levels to \$199.6 billion in budget authority [BA] and \$199.5 billion in outlays. For fiscal year 2001, the resolution sets forth \$215.7 billion in BA and \$216.0 billion in outlays. Over 5 years, it provides \$1,211.0 billion in BA and \$1,211.3 billion in outlays.

Senate Amendment.—The Senate amendment revises the fiscal year 2000 levels to \$199.6 billion in BA and \$199.5 billion in outlays. For fiscal year 2001, it sets forth \$218.8 billion in BA and \$219.0 billion in outlays. Over 5 years, it provides \$1,251.2 billion in BA and \$1,251.4 billion in outlays.

Conference Agreement.—The Conference Agreement revises the fiscal year 2000 levels to \$199.6 billion in BA and \$199.5 billion in outlays. For fiscal year 2001, it sets forth \$217.7 billion in BA and \$218.0 billion in outlays. Over 5 years, it provides \$1,251.1 billion in BA and \$1,251.3 billion in outlays.

FUNCTION 600: INCOME SECURITY

Major Programs in Function.—The Income Security function covers most of the Federal Government's income support programs. The function includes general retirement and disability insurance (excluding Social Security)—mainly through the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation—and benefits to railroad retirees. Other components are Federal employee retirement and disability benefits (including military retirees); unemployment compensation; low-income housing assistance; food and nutrition assistance; and other income security programs. This last category includes Temporary Assistance to Needy Families [TANF], the Government's principal welfare program; Supplemental Security Income [SSI]; and spending for the refundable portion of the Earned Income Credit [EIC]. Agencies involved in these programs include the Departments of Agriculture, Health and Human Services, Housing and Urban Development, and Education; the Social Security Administration (for SSI); and the Office of Personnel Management (for Federal retirement benefits).

House Resolution.—The House resolution revises the fiscal year 2000 levels to \$238.4 billion in budget authority [BA] and \$248.0 billion in outlays. For fiscal year 2001, the resolution sets forth \$252.2 billion in BA and \$254.9 billion in outlays. Over 5 years, it provides \$1,363.0 billion in BA and \$1,371.7 billion in outlays.

Senate Amendment.—The Senate amendment revises the fiscal year 2000 levels to \$238.9 billion in BA and \$248.1 billion in outlays. For fiscal year 2001, it sets forth \$253.2 billion in BA and \$255.4 billion in outlays. Over 5 years, it provides \$1,375.5 billion in BA and \$1,390.7 billion in outlays.

Conference Agreement.—The Conference Agreement revises the fiscal year 2000 levels to \$238.9 billion in BA and \$248.1 billion in outlays. For fiscal year 2001, it sets forth \$252.3 billion in BA and \$255.0 billion in outlays. Over 5 years, it provides \$1,369.8 billion in BA and \$1,381.9 billion in outlays.

FUNCTION 650: SOCIAL SECURITY

Major Programs in Function.—Function 650 consists of the Social Security Program, or Old Age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance [OASDI]. It is the largest budget function in terms of outlays, and provides funds for the Government's largest entitlement program. Under provisions of the Budget Enforcement

Act, Social Security trust funds are off budget. However, the administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration [SSA], which manages the program, and the income taxes collected on Social Security benefits are reflected in the figures below.

House Resolution.—The House resolution revises the fiscal year 2000 on-budget levels to \$14.7 billion in budget authority [BA] and outlays. For fiscal year 2001, the resolution sets forth on-budget totals of \$13.1 billion in BA and \$13.0 billion in outlays. Over 5 years, it provides on-budget amounts of \$77.7 billion in BA and \$77.4 billion in outlays.

Senate Amendment.—The Senate amendment revises the fiscal year 2000 on-budget levels to \$11.5 billion in BA and outlays. For fiscal year 2001, it sets forth on-budget totals of \$9.7 billion in BA and outlays. Over 5 years, it provides on-budget amounts of \$60.4 billion in BA and outlays.

Conference Agreement.—The Conference Agreement revises the fiscal year 2000 on-budget levels to \$11.5 billion in BA and outlays. For fiscal year 2001, it sets forth on-budget totals of \$9.7 billion in BA and outlays. Over 5 years, it provides on-budget amounts of \$60.4 billion in BA and outlays.

FUNCTION 700: VETERANS BENEFITS AND SERVICES

Major Programs in Function.—The Veterans Benefits and Services function reflects funding for the Department of Veterans Affairs [VA], which provides benefits to veterans who meet various eligibility rules. Benefits range from income security for veterans; veterans education, training, and rehabilitation services; and veterans' hospital and medical care. As of 1 July 1999, there were about 25 million veterans, and about 45 million family members of living veterans and survivors of deceased veterans.

House Resolution.—The House resolution revises the fiscal year 2000 levels to \$46.0 billion in budget authority [BA] and \$45.2 billion in outlays. For fiscal year 2001, it sets forth \$47.8 billion in BA and \$47.4 billion in outlays. Over 5 years, it provides \$254.9 billion in BA and \$253.5 billion in outlays.

Senate Amendment.—The Senate amendment revises the fiscal year 2000 levels to \$46.0 billion in BA and \$45.1 billion in outlays. For fiscal year 2001, it sets forth \$48.6 billion in BA and \$48.1 billion in outlays. Over 5 years, it provides \$257.9 billion in BA and \$256.3 billion in outlays.

Conference Agreement.—The Conference Agreement revises the fiscal year 2000 levels to \$46.0 billion in BA and \$45.1 billion in outlays. For fiscal year 2001, it sets forth \$47.8 billion in BA and \$47.4 billion in outlays. Over 5 years, it provides \$255.1 billion in BA and \$253.7 billion in outlays.

FUNCTION 750: ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

Major Programs in Function.—This function provides funding for Federal law enforcement activities. This includes criminal investigations by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Drug Enforcement Administration, and border enforcement and the control of illegal immigration by the Customs Service and Immigration and Naturalization Service. Also funded through this function are the Federal courts, Federal prison construction, and criminal justice assistance.

House Resolution.—The House resolution revises the fiscal year 2000 levels to \$27.3 billion in budget authority [BA] and \$28.0 billion in outlays. For fiscal year 2001, the resolution sets forth \$28.0 billion in BA and outlays. Over 5 years, it provides \$140.3 billion in BA and \$139.9 billion in outlays.

Senate Amendment.—The Senate amendment revises the fiscal year 2000 levels to \$27.4 billion in BA and \$28.0 billion in outlays. For fiscal year 2001, it sets forth \$28.2 billion in BA and \$28.3 billion in outlays.

Over 5 years, it provides \$149.3 billion in BA and \$149.2 billion in outlays.

Conference Agreement.—The Conference Agreement revises the fiscal year 2000 levels to \$27.4 billion in BA and \$28.0 billion in outlays. For fiscal year 2001, it sets forth \$28.0 billion in BA and \$28.1 billion in outlays. Over 5 years, it provides \$143.1 billion in BA and \$142.9 billion in outlays.

FUNCTION 800: GENERAL GOVERNMENT

Major Programs in Function.—The General Government function consists of the activities of the Legislative Branch; the Executive Office of the President; general tax collection and fiscal operations of the Department of Treasury (including the Internal Revenue Service, which accounts for almost two-thirds of the spending in this function); the property and personnel costs of the General Services Administration and the Office of Personnel Management; general purpose fiscal assistance to States, localities, the District of Columbia, and territories of the United States; and other general activities of the Federal Government.

House Resolution.—The House resolution revises the fiscal year 2000 levels to \$13.9 billion in budget authority [BA] and \$14.7 billion in outlays. For fiscal year 2001, the resolution sets forth \$13.6 billion in BA and \$14.2 billion in outlays. Over 5 years, it provides \$67.8 billion in BA and \$69.0 billion in outlays.

Senate Amendment.—The Senate amendment revises the fiscal year 2000 levels to \$13.7 billion in BA and \$14.7 billion in outlays. For fiscal year 2001, it sets forth \$14.4 billion in BA and \$14.3 billion in outlays. Over 5 years, it provides \$68.8 billion in BA and \$69.4 billion in outlays.

Conference Agreement.—The Conference Agreement revises the fiscal year 2000 levels to \$13.7 billion in BA and \$14.7 billion in outlays. For fiscal year 2001, it sets forth \$14.0 billion in BA and \$14.3 billion in outlays. Over 5 years, it provides \$68.4 billion in BA and \$69.4 billion in outlays.

FUNCTION 900: NET INTEREST

Major Programs in Function.—Net Interest is the interest paid for the Federal Government's borrowing minus the interest income received by the Federal Government. Interest is a mandatory payment, with no discretionary components.

House Resolution.—The House resolution revises the fiscal year 2000 on-budget levels to \$284.6 billion in budget authority [BA] and outlays. For fiscal year 2001, it sets forth on-budget levels of \$288.5 billion in BA and outlays. Over 5 years, it provides on-budget amounts of \$1,420.5 billion in BA and outlays.

Senate Amendment.—The Senate amendment revises the fiscal year 2000 on-budget levels to \$284.7 billion in BA and outlays. For fiscal year 2001, it sets forth on-budget levels of \$289.0 billion in BA and outlays. Over 5 years, it provides on-budget amounts of \$1,431.7 billion in BA and outlays.

Conference Agreement.—The Conference Agreement revises the fiscal year 2000 on-budget levels to \$284.6 billion in BA and outlays. For fiscal year 2001, it sets forth on-budget levels of \$288.6 billion in BA and outlays. Over 5 years, it provides on-budget amounts of \$1,427.3 billion in BA and outlays.

FUNCTION 920: ALLOWANCES

Major Programs in Function.—The Allowances function is used for planning purposes to address the budgetary effects of proposals or assumptions that cross various other budget functions. Once such changes are enacted, the budgetary effects are distributed to the appropriate budget functions.

House Resolution.—The House resolution revises the fiscal year 2000 levels to \$8.5 billion in budget authority [BA] and \$11.5 billion in

outlays. For fiscal year 2001, the resolution sets forth -\$4.7 billion in BA and -\$8.7 billion in outlays. Over 5 years, it provides -\$18.1 billion in BA and -\$20.2 billion in outlays.

Senate Amendment.—The Senate amendment has no effect on fiscal year 2000 levels. For fiscal year 2001, it sets forth -\$6.0 billion in BA and -\$5.6 billion in outlays; and over 5 years, -\$8.0 billion in BA and -\$26.6 billion in outlays.

Conference Agreement.—The Conference Agreement has no effect on the fiscal year 2000 levels. For fiscal year 2001, it sets forth -\$5.5 billion in BA and -\$4.6 billion in outlays. Over 5 years, it provides -\$15.0 billion in BA and -\$23.0 billion in outlays.

FUNCTION 950: UNDISTRIBUTED OFFSETTING RECEIPTS

Major Programs in Function.—Receipts recorded in this function are either intrabudgetary (a payment from one Federal agency to another, such as agency payments to the retirement trust funds) or proprietary (a payment from the public for some kind of business transaction with the Government). The main types of receipts recorded in this function are: the payments Federal employees and agencies make to employee retirement trust funds; payments made by companies for the right to explore and produce oil and gas on the Outer Continental Shelf; and payments by those who bid for the right to buy or use public property or resources, such as the electromagnetic spectrum. These receipts are treated as negative spending.

House Resolution.—The House resolution revises the fiscal year 2000 on-budget levels to -\$34.1 billion in budget authority [BA] and outlays. For fiscal year 2001, it sets forth on-budget levels of -\$38.4 billion in BA and outlays. Over 5 years, it provides on-budget amounts of -\$197.7 billion in BA and outlays.

Senate Amendment.—The Senate amendment revises the fiscal year 2000 on-budget levels to -\$34.3 billion in BA and outlays. For fiscal year 2001, it sets forth on-budget levels of -\$38.4 billion in BA and outlays. Over 5 years, it provides on-budget amounts of -\$200.6 billion in BA and outlays.

Conference Agreement.—The Conference Agreement revises the fiscal year 2000 on-budget levels to -\$34.3 billion in BA and outlays. For fiscal year 2001, it sets forth on-budget levels of -\$38.3 billion in BA and outlays. Over 5 years, it provides on-budget amounts of -\$197.6 billion in BA and outlays.

REVENUES

Section 301(a)(2) of the Budget Act requires the budget resolution to include the total Federal revenues and the amount, if any, by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be increased or decreased.

House Resolution.—The House resolution revises the fiscal year 2000 on-budget revenue level to \$1,465.5 billion. It sets forth on-budget revenues of \$1,504.8 billion in fiscal year 2001 and \$8,022.4 billion over 5 years.

Senate Amendment.—The Senate amendment revises the fiscal year 2000 on-budget revenue level to \$1,464.6 billion. It sets forth on-budget revenues of \$1,501.8 billion for fiscal year 2001 and \$8,025.4 billion over 5 years.

Conference Agreement.—The Conference Agreement revises the fiscal year 2000 on-budget revenue level to \$1,465.5 billion. It sets forth on-budget revenues of \$1,503.2 billion in fiscal year 2001 and \$8,022.4 billion over 5 years.

The revenue levels in the Conference Agreement can accommodate tax relief and fairness legislation that has already begun

to move in the current session of the 106th Congress. In addition, the revenue levels in the Conference Agreement would accommodate the revenue effects from legislation that would permit members of the Armed Forces to participate in the Thrift Savings Plan.

RECONCILIATION INSTRUCTIONS

Under section 310(a) of the Budget Act, the budget resolution may include directives to the committees of jurisdiction to make revisions in law necessary to accomplish a specified change in new budget authority or revenue. If the resolution includes directives to only one committee of the House or Senate, then that committee is required to directly report to its House legislative language of its design that would implement the spending or revenue changes provided for in the resolution. Any bill considered pursuant to a reconciliation instruction is subject to special procedures set forth in section 310(b), (c), (d), and (e) and section 313 of the Budget Act.

House resolution

Section 4 contains two sets of instructions to the Committee on Ways and Means: one for tax relief, and the other for debt reduction. The reporting schedule for the tax bills is as follows: first bill, May 26; second bill, June 23; third bill, July 28; and fourth bill, September 22. The bills providing for a reduction in debt held by the public coincide with the first and last tax bills on May 26 and September 22. The Committee assumes it will be unnecessary to consider the second debt reduction bill if the President agrees to the earlier reconciliation bills.

Subsection (a) directs the Committee on Ways and Means to report legislation that will achieve a reduction in revenue of \$10 billion in fiscal year 2001 and \$150 billion over 5 years. Although the budget resolution assumes a year-to-year distribution of the revenue reduction for the tax bills, the Ways and Means Committee bill may be higher or lower than these year-to-year levels as long as the net revenue loss does not exceed the first-year and five-year totals.

Subsection (b) directs the Committee on Ways and Means to report two bills that would reduce the level of debt held by the public: the first bill must reduce debt by \$10 billion in fiscal year 2001 and the second bill must reduce debt by no more than \$20 billion in fiscal year 2001.

Senate amendment

The Senate amendment contains a reconciliation instruction to reduce revenues by not more than \$13.033 billion for fiscal year 2001 and by not more than \$147.087 billion for the sum of the fiscal years 2001 through 2005.

The Senate Finance Committee would be required to report reconciliation legislation by September 22, 2000.

Conference agreement

Section 103 of the Conference Agreement includes instructions to the Committee on Ways and Means to report two bills that reduce revenue by a total of \$11.6 billion for fiscal year 2001 and \$150 billion for the period of fiscal year 2001 through 2005. The Committee on Ways and Means is required to report the first bill to the House on July 14 and the second bill on September 13.

In addition, the Conference Agreement directs the Committee on Ways and Means to report two separate bills that reduce debt held by the public. The first bill must reduce debt held by the public by \$7.5 billion and the second by up to \$19.1 billion. The conferees intend for the second bill to lock in for debt

reduction any part of the amounts assumed for tax relief if the tax bills do not become law. These bills are to be reported by July 14 and September 13, respectively. While the reporting dates for these two bills coincide with the deadlines for the two tax bills, they are to be reported as separate freestanding bills.

Section 104 of the Conference Agreement provides for two reconciliation bills in the Senate (the first, reported from the Senate Finance Committee by July 14, 2000, and the second reported from the Senate Finance Committee by September 13, 2000). The sum of the bills (if both were to be enacted) may not exceed \$11.6 billion for 2001 and \$150 billion for fiscal years 2001 through 2005.

302(a) ALLOCATIONS

As required in section 302(a) of the Budget Act, the joint statement of managers includes an allocation, based on the Conference Agreement, of total budget authority and total outlays for each House and Senate committee.

Conference Agreement

The joint statement of managers establishes allocations that are consistent with the budgetary totals and functional levels in Title I. The joint statement establishes allocations for the budget year, fiscal year 2001, and each of the out-years covered by the budget resolution, fiscal years 2001 through 2005. In addition, the joint statement provides a revised allocation for fiscal year 2000.

In the House, the 302(a) allocation to the Appropriations Committee is also divided into separate categories for general purpose discretionary, mass transit and highways. The allocations to the authorizing committees in the House are also divided into current law, assumed discretionary action levels, and reauthorizations.

As required under section 302(a), the allocations for the House and the Senate are also displayed in three separate discretionary categories that are consistent with the limits set forth in section 250(c)(4) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 [Deficit Control Act]: general purpose discretionary, mass transit, and highways.

Although this resolution revises the levels for fiscal year 2000, new allocations to Senate Committees are not displayed herein because there is no further change from current law assumed for 2000 in this resolution that needs to be allocated.

The 302(a) allocations are as follows:

ALLOCATIONS OF SPENDING AUTHORITY TO HOUSE COMMITTEES Appropriations Committee (In millions of dollars)

	2000	2001
General Purpose: ¹		
BA	570,315	599,040
OT	575,688	592,771
Highways: ¹		
BA	0	0
OT	24,393	27,314
Mass Transit: ¹		
BA	0	1,255
OT	4,570	4,994
Violent Crime: ¹		
BA	4,486	na
OT	6,999	na
Total Discretionary Action:		
BA	574,801	600,295
OT	611,650	625,079
Current Law Mandatory:		
BA	307,642	325,936
OT	293,762	309,098

¹ Shown for display purposes only.

ALLOCATIONS OF SPENDING AUTHORITY TO HOUSE COMMITTEES

[Committees other than appropriations]
[In millions of dollars]

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2001–05
Agriculture Committee							
Current Law:							
BA	\$25,763	14,463	13,647	3,338	3,185	3,189	37,822
OT	21,623	10,748	10,241	–237	–248	–90	20,214
Discretionary Action:							
BA	0	1,422	1,525	1,657	1,745	1,848	8,197
OT	0	655	1,459	1,583	1,696	1,791	7,184
Reauthorizations:							
BA	0	0	0	29,866	29,968	29,294	89,128
OT	0	0	0	28,914	29,922	29,254	88,090
Total:							
BA	25,763	15,885	15,172	34,861	34,898	34,331	135,147
OT	21,623	11,403	11,700	30,260	31,370	30,755	115,488
Armed Services Committee							
Current Law:							
BA	48,603	50,142	51,686	53,321	55,120	57,044	267,313
OT	48,786	50,126	51,629	53,234	55,034	56,954	266,977
Banking and Financial Services Committee							
Current Law:							
BA	2538	4050	4925	4479	3992	3938	21384
OT	–3,800	–2,142	–1,019	–1,294	–2,425	–2,361	–9,241
Discretionary Action:							
BA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OT	0	–107	–225	–304	–332	–361	–1,329
Total:							
BA	2,538	4,050	4,925	4,479	3,992	3,938	21,384
OT	–3,800	–2,249	–1,244	–1,598	–2,757	–2,722	–10,570
Committee on Education and the Workforce							
Current Law:							
BA	2,746	5,673	5,731	5,310	4,842	5,050	26,606
OT	1,638	4,928	5,177	4,962	4,551	4,559	24,177
Reauthorizations:							
BA	0	0	305	305	791	814	2,215
OT	0	0	58	244	699	810	1,811
Total:							
BA	2,746	5,673	6,036	5,615	5,633	5,864	28,821
OT	1,638	4,928	5,235	5,206	5,250	5,369	25,988
Commerce Committee							
Current Law:							
BA	7,810	8,265	8,799	10,374	15,153	16,240	58,831
OT	5,267	6,516	9,024	9,902	15,311	16,329	57,082
International Relations Committee							
Current Law:							
BA	9,908	11,385	11,715	11,799	11,813	12,098	58,810
OT	10,057	10,129	10,426	10,580	10,818	11,019	52,972
Government Reform Committee							
Current Law:							
BA	58,939	60,323	62,581	64,886	67,334	69,857	324,981
OT	57,462	58,905	61,212	63,575	66,128	68,719	318,539
Committee on House Administration							
Current Law:							
BA	120	113	87	89	86	87	462
OT	291	68	32	58	252	41	451
Resources Committee							
Current Law:							
BA	2,465	2,546	2,307	2,314	2,362	2,451	11,980
OT	2,446	2,493	2,339	2,431	2,378	2,400	12,041
Discretionary Action:							
BA	0	0	41	40	40	41	162
OT	0	0	–18	1	23	38	44
Total:							
BA	2,465	2,546	2,348	2,354	2,402	2,492	12,142
OT	2,446	2,493	2,321	2,432	2,401	2,438	12,085
Judiciary Committee							
Current Law:							
BA	3,688	5,590	5,177	5,261	5,333	5,332	26,693
OT	3,546	5,076	5,149	5,115	5,115	5,249	25,704
Transportation and Infrastructure Committee							
Current Law:							
BA	47,668	51,193	49,090	49,765	12,224	12,271	17,4543
OT	9,923	9,747	9,700	9,701	9,508	9,213	47,869
Reauthorizations:							
BA	0	0	0	0	37,578	37,578	75,156
OT	0	0	0	0	104	306	410
Total:							
BA	47,668	51,193	49,090	49,765	49,802	49,849	249,699
OT	9,923	9,747	9,700	9,701	9,612	9,519	48,279
Science Committee							
Current Law:							
BA	90	81	60	61	62	62	326
OT	70	79	86	73	64	62	364
Small Business Committee							
Current Law:							
BA	–295	0	0	0	0	0	0
OT	–460	–195	–160	–150	–140	–100	–745
Veterans' Affairs Committee							
Current Law:							
BA	1,657	1,367	1,365	1,368	1,379	1,358	6,837
OT	1,417	1,273	1,392	1,355	1,372	1,359	6,751
Discretionary Action:							
BA	0	510	1,044	1,271	1,841	2,614	7,280
OT	0	479	998	1,224	1,791	2,545	7,037
Total:							
BA	1,657	1,877	2,409	2,639	3,220	3,972	14,117
OT	1,417	1,752	2,390	2,579	3,163	3,904	13,788
Ways and Means Committee							
Current Law:							
BA	671,727	697,871	712,893	716,096	736,022	763,480	3,626,362
OT	669,844	696,956	712,378	714,907	734,695	761,823	3,620,759

ALLOCATIONS OF SPENDING AUTHORITY TO HOUSE COMMITTEES—Continued

[Committees other than appropriations]
[In millions of dollars]

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2001–05
Reauthorizations:							
BA	0	0	215	19,718	19,919	19,925	59,777
OT	0	0	155	19,875	20,787	21,095	61,912
Discretionary Action:							
BA	–50	55	1,356	1,484	167	–27	3,035
OT	0	25	1,375	1,502	162	–26	3,038
Total:							
BA	671,677	697,926	714,464	737,298	756,108	783,378	3,689,174
OT	669,844	696,981	713,908	736,284	755,644	782,892	3,685,709

SENATE COMMITTEE BUDGET AUTHORITY AND OUTLAY ALLOCATIONS PURSUANT TO SECTION 302 OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT BUDGET YEAR TOTAL 2001

[In millions of dollars]

Committee	Direct spending jurisdiction		Entitlements funded in annual appropriations acts	
	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays
Appropriations:				
General Purpose Discretionary	541,095	547,279	0	0
Memo: on-budget	537,688	543,948		
Off-budget	3,407	3,331		
Highways	0	26,920	0	0
Mass Transit	0	4,639	0	0
Mandatory	327,879	310,226	0	0
Total	868,974	889,064	0	0
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry	14,254	10,542	29,517	11,943
Armed Services	50,139	50,129	0	0
Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs	4,050	–2,339	0	0
Commerce, Science, and Transportation	7,341	3,433	739	737
Energy and Natural Resources	2,429	2,373	40	51
Environment and Public Works	39,643	2,029	0	0
Finance	708,475	705,890	165,436	165,915
Foreign Relations	11,364	10,107	0	0
Governmental Affairs	60,323	58,905	0	0
Judiciary	5,590	5,076	253	253
Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions	9,959	9,181	1,382	1,381
Rules and Administration	113	68	0	0
Veterans' Affairs	1,497	1,493	24,527	24,444
Indian Affairs	192	189	0	0
Small Business	0	–195	0	0
Unassigned to Committee	–313,951	–296,951	0	0
Total	1,470,392	1,448,994	221,894	204,724

IMPLEMENTATION AND ENFORCEMENT OF
LEVELS

Section 301(b)(4) of the Budget Act permits the resolution to “. . . require such other procedures, relating to the budget, as may be appropriate to carry out the purposes of this Act.” Authority for Congress to determine its own rules is set forth in Section 5 of Article I of the United States Constitution. Under these authorities, budget resolutions have formulated congressional procedures to enforce budgetary limitations, accommodated legislation with costs not reflected in the resolution, and implemented the levels and assumptions set forth by the resolution.

ENFORCEMENT PROCEDURES

The Budget Act establishes procedures to enforce the levels set forth in the budget resolution. The budget resolution also can establish additional rules to enforce the budgetary levels it sets forth. Most budget-related rules so established are enforced through points of order that can be raised by any Member of the appropriate House immediately prior to the consideration of legislation. Usually such points of order may be raised against any bill or joint resolution, amendments thereto or a Conference Agreement thereon. In some cases, the points of order apply to certain motions.

House resolution

Section 5 extends an existing point of order established to prevent Social Security surpluses from being reduced. Subsection (a) provides various findings relating to the budgetary status of Social Security.

Subsection (b) establishes a freestanding rule prohibiting the consideration in the House or the Senate of any budget resolution that sets forth an on-budget deficit. It recognizes that if the budget resolution provides for an on-budget deficit, it is implicitly rely-

ing on Social Security to finance the general operations of the Federal Government. Paragraph (2) clarifies that, for purposes of that section, deficit levels are those set forth in the resolution pursuant to section 301 of the Budget Act.

Section 6 prohibits the House from considering legislation that would reduce the surplus below the levels set forth in section 2(4) of the resolution (as adjusted for the reserve funds). The reason for this new rule is to ensure that the portion of the surplus reserved for tax cuts is used to pay down the debt if the tax reductions do not become law. Under current law, committees can circumvent the allocations, aggregates and discretionary limits by simply designating legislation an emergency. This designation results in a dollar-for-dollar increase in the allocations, aggregates, and discretionary spending limits. As one committee recently observed in a report accompanying a bill, the only real constraint on such committees is the adverse publicity that would result if the emergency-designated appropriations resulted in an on-budget deficit.

This restriction is enforced by a point of order which, if sustained, would preclude further consideration of an offending measure. The point of order would apply to both tax and spending bills. With respect to spending bills, the point of order would apply to both direct spending bills reported by authorizing committees and appropriations bills reported by the Appropriations Committee. For the purpose of the point of order, the surplus is the amount established in section 2(4). These levels are adjusted for the revenue legislation set forth in the reconciliation instructions in section 4 and are subject to the adjustments and reserve funds provided for in the resolution.

Section 31 establishes two new restrictions designed to prevent the House from considering legislation that circumvents the allocations and aggregates set forth in the budget resolution. Both restrictions are enforceable through points of order that preclude consideration of an offending measure. The points of order may be raised against any reported bill, joint resolution, amendment to such a measure or any resulting Conference Agreement. They are applicable in both the House and the Senate. These two restrictions are outlined below.

Subsection (a) prohibits the consideration of legislation that would direct the Congressional Budget Office [CBO] or the Office of Management and Budget [OMB] to estimate the costs of a measure in a specified manner. This subsection assumes that any type of directed scoring is intended to circumvent a committee's allocation, the budget resolution's aggregate levels of budget authority and outlays, or the discretionary spending limits set forth in the Deficit Control Act. In the absence of such directed scoring, CBO and OMB are required to adhere to scoring conventions set forth in sections 257 of the Deficit Control Act and the joint statement of managers accompanying the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 (H. Rept. 105-217).

Subsection (b)(1) prohibits the consideration of legislation that would provide an amount of advance discretionary spending exceeding \$23 billion. Subsection (b)(2) defines an advance appropriation as any general appropriation for fiscal year 2001 that would provide budget authority first made available in fiscal year 2002 or later. A significant level of advanced appropriations is permitted because in some programmatic areas, such as education, the planning cycle of State or local government recipients does not coincide with the Federal budget cycle.

These governments need to know in advance how much they will receive from the Federal Government in order to accurately develop their budgets.

The Committee assumes that in order to advise the presiding officer on a point of order, the chairman will monitor the current level of enacted advanced appropriations in conjunction with the Current Level reports required by sections 302(f), 311(a), and Rule 26 of the Rules of Procedure for the House Budget Committee.

Senate amendment

Section 201: Congressional Lockbox for Social Security Surpluses. The Senate amendment contains language which is very similar to section 201 of the Conference Agreement on the fiscal year 2000 budget resolution. This "Social Security lockbox," as it is known, provides a point of order in both the House of Representatives and the Senate against a budget resolution that sets forth an on-budget deficit for any fiscal year. This ensures that Social Security surpluses can not be used to finance deficit spending.

The point of order will now be permanent and in the Senate will require 60 votes for a waiver or to sustain an appeal. In addition, a "double lock" is now attached to this lockbox point of order by adding a "lookback". The "lookback" requires that after the end of the fiscal year, in its next budget resolution, Congress must look back to see if any deficit spending has occurred and make the Social Security trust fund whole in the subsequent year by reducing future discretionary spending by an equivalent amount.

Section 207: Emergency Designation Point of Order in the Senate. The Senate amendment contains language which provides a 60-vote point of order in the Senate against any legislation (including Conference Agreements) that contains an emergency designation with respect to any spending or revenues. Subsection (g) contains an exception for all discretionary defense spending. This section is very similar to section 206 of the Conference Agreement on the fiscal year 2000 budget resolution with one exception: the point of order is now permanent. As was the case last year, the point of order would operate similar to the Senate's Byrd Rule (section 313 of the Budget Act) in that if the point of order is sustained, the offending language (in this case the emergency designation) can be excised from the bill, amendment or Conference Agreement, leaving the remainder intact. This is likely to result in the remaining language then being subject to some other Budget Act point of order because the additional spending would then be scored against either the discretionary spending limits, the section 311 aggregates, or a committee's allocation.

Section 208: Reserve Fund Pending the Increase of fiscal year 2001 Discretionary Spending Limits. Section 312(b) of the Budget Act provides a 60-vote point of order in the Senate against any legislation that exceeds the discretionary spending limits set forth in section 251 of the Deficit Control Act. This point of order applies to a concurrent resolution on the budget as well as substantive legislation. Sustaining the current discretionary spending limits is not feasible based on recent budget submissions by President Clinton and congressional action.

The Senate amendment envisions a level of discretionary spending which exceeds the current statutory limits. However, because of the restrictions of section 312(b), the functional totals and spending aggregates contained in this resolution technically indicate a level of discretionary spending that adheres to the current-law limits. The section 302(a) allocation to the Committee on Appropria-

tions is also in compliance with the current limits. This is achieved by assuming a reserve amount within function 920 (allowances).

The Senate amendment contains language which provides the chairman of the Committee on the Budget in the Senate with the authority to adjust the section 302(a) allocation to the Committee on Appropriations up to the level of discretionary spending envisioned by the resolution, only after legislation has been enacted that increases the statutory discretionary spending limits. For the purposes of this section, the Senate amendment assumes that only the fiscal year 2001 limits will be increased. No assumption is made with respect to the appropriate level for fiscal year 2002. The Senate amendment also intends that in order to maintain mathematical consistency and accurate enforcement of the budget resolution, the chairman will also be authorized to adjust the aggregates contained in the resolution. Therefore it will be necessary to amend the language of section 208 to provide the chairman with this additional authority.

Section 209: Congressional Firewall for Defense and Non-Defense Spending. The Senate amendment contains language that, upon the enactment of legislation which increases the discretionary spending limits for fiscal year 2001, establishes a "firewall" between defense and nondefense discretionary spending in the Senate. This firewall consists of limits on the overall level of both defense and nondefense spending. The nondefense portion includes the outlays for both highways and mass transit. These limits will be enforced by a 60-vote point of order against a measure that exceeds the limits.

Section 210: Mechanisms for Strengthening Budgetary Integrity. The Senate amendment contains language establishing two new points of order in the Senate, one with respect to advanced appropriations and the other with respect to delayed obligations. Both points of order require 60-votes for a waiver or to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair. Similar to the emergency designation point of order in section 207 of the Senate amendment, these points of order also operate like the Byrd Rule: if the point of order is sustained, the offending language will be excised from the measure—including the Conference Agreement. Both points of order expire at the end of fiscal year 2002 in keeping with the lifetime of the current discretionary spending limits.

Section 210(b) of the Senate amendment provides a point of order against any appropriation that results in the sum of all advances from fiscal year 2001 into fiscal year 2002 (or into any subsequent fiscal year) in excess of the amounts that were advanced from fiscal year 2000 into fiscal year 2001 for education programs (\$23 billion).

Section 210(c) of the Senate amendment provides a point of order against the use of any delayed obligations in an appropriations bill with specific exceptions for any delays in the defense category and any reoccurring or customary delays (including a date and a dollar limitation) that are listed in this section. These specified delays total approximately \$11.2 billion.

Section 210(g) of the Senate amendment provides guidance for interpreting the germaneness requirement found in section 305(b)(2) of the Budget Act. Section 305 requires that all amendments offered on the floor to a budget resolution or a reconciliation bill must be germane to the underlying legislation and is enforced by a 60-vote point of order in the Senate. The Senate amendment states that an amendment will be considered not germane if it contains only precatory (non-binding) language. This is designed to place a 60-vote hurdle with respect

to what is commonly referred to as "sense of the Senate" amendments. Note that it is not meant to preclude the inclusion of "purpose" or "findings" language that is part of an otherwise substantive amendment.

Conference agreement

Section 201 of the Conference Agreement extends section 201 of H. Con. Res. 68, which prohibits the consideration in both the House and the Senate of any budget resolution that sets forth an on-budget deficit. Subsection (a) makes various findings regarding the relationship between the Social Security surplus and the Federal budget. This section is enforceable by a point of order that may be waived by a majority vote in the House and a three-fifths vote in the Senate. The rule applies to any budget resolution establishing levels for fiscal year 2002 or revising the levels set forth in this resolution for fiscal year 2001. It also applies to amendments or Conference Agreements on such resolutions. As with other budget-related points of order, determinations of the appropriate levels are made by the Budget Committee of the appropriate House. The Conference Agreement includes the exception contained in the Senate amendment for periods of war or low economic growth.

Section 202 of the Conference Agreement establishes a procedure for preserving the surpluses set forth in the resolution. This procedure applies only to the House. Section 202 specifically prohibits the consideration of any measure in the House that would reduce the surplus below the level set forth in section 101(4) (as appropriately adjusted). It is enforced by a point of order which, if sustained, would preclude consideration of the measure. The House conferees intend for determinations of whether a measure would cause the surplus to be less than the levels in the budget resolution in the same manner as such determinations are made under Section 311(a) of the Budget Act.

In order to enforce this provision, the House Budget Committee will monitor the current level of the surplus, which is a function of enacted spending and tax legislation, and the surplus levels set forth in the budget resolution.

This point of order will not preclude the consideration of legislation assumed in the appropriate surplus levels for which adjustments are made pursuant to sections 214 through 220.

The House conferees intend this mechanism to ensure that the surpluses reserved for either tax relief or debt reduction are not used to finance higher spending. Under current law and the terms of recent budget resolutions, there is nothing to prevent spending and tax legislation from eroding the surplus set forth in the resolution. A measure may implicitly tap into this surplus by providing an appropriation for any program or purpose enumerated in section 314 of the Budget Act. Doing so automatically increases the levels in the budget resolution above their original amounts, thereby reducing the current level of the surplus. This mechanism is designed to prevent this from happening.

Section 203 of the Conference Agreement provides for the enhanced enforcement of budgetary limits. It applies only to the House. Subsection (a) prohibits consideration in the House of appropriation bills containing directed scoring language. A directed scoring provision is defined as legislative language that directs CBO or OMB how to estimate the discretionary new budget authority of a provision for budget enforcement purposes. The House conferees intend for appropriate scoring conventions to be used to enforce the budget resolution under the Budget Act, and the appropriations caps and pay-as-you-go [PAYGO] requirements set

forth in the Deficit Control Act. The conferees recognize it may be necessary to occasionally waive this provision in order to assure that costs are scored to the appropriate committee in omnibus appropriations bills. This subsection expires on January 1, 2001.

Subsection (b)(1) prohibits the consideration in the House of legislation that would provide an amount of advance discretionary spending exceeding \$23.5 billion. Subsection (b)(2) defines an advance appropriation as any general appropriation for fiscal year 2001 that would provide budget authority first made available in fiscal year 2002 or later. This subsection also expires on January 1, 2001.

Section 204 of the Conference Agreement contains language establishing two new points of order in the Senate, one with respect to advance appropriations and the other with respect to delayed obligations. Total advances are limited to \$23.5 billion and permissible delays include only those which are recurring or customary or relate to discretionary defense spending. Both points of order require 60-votes for a waiver or to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair. Similar to the emergency designation point of order in section 207 of the Senate amendment, these points of order also operate like the Byrd Rule; if the point of order is sustained, the offending language will be excised from the measure—including any conference agreement. Both points of order expire at the end of fiscal year 2002 in keeping with the lifetime of the current discretionary spending limits. The Conference Agreement also retains the provision from section 210(g) of the Senate Amendment with a modification.

Section 205 of the Conference Agreement retains the language from section 207 of the Senate amendment which establishes a 60-vote point of order in the Senate against legislation (including Conference Agreements) that contains an emergency designation with respect to any spending or revenues. Subsection (g) contains an exception for all discretionary defense spending. This section is very similar to section 206 of the Conference Agreement on the fiscal year 2000 budget resolution with one exception: the point of order is now made permanent. As was the case last year, the point of order would operate similarly to the Senate's Byrd Rule (section 313 of the Budget Act) in that if the point of order is sustained, the offending language (in this case the emergency designation) can be excised from the bill, amendment or Conference Agreement, leaving the remainder in tact. This is likely to result in the remaining language then being subject to some other Budget Act point of order because the additional spending would then be scored against either the discretionary spending limits, the section 311 aggregates, or a committee's allocation.

Section 206 of the Conference Agreement retains the language from section 208 of the Senate amendment and establishes a mecha-

nism in the Senate for implementing an increase in fiscal year 2001 discretionary spending limits. This provision permits the chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget to revise the section 302(a) allocation to the Committee on Appropriations (and other appropriate budgetary levels), once an increase in the discretionary spending limits for fiscal year 2001 is enacted.

Section 207 of the Conference Agreement retains the language of section 209 of the Senate amendment and provides that, upon the enactment of legislation increasing the discretionary spending limits for fiscal year 2001, there is established a "firewall" between defense and nondefense discretionary spending in the Senate. This firewall consists of limits on the overall level of both defense and nondefense spending. The non-defense portion includes the outlays for both highways and mass transit. These limits will be enforced by a 60-vote point of order against a measure that exceeds the limits.

The Senate's PAYGO point of order was modified in section 207 of the Conference Agreement on the fiscal year 2000 budget resolution to make clear that spending of on-budget surpluses would not violate the PAYGO rule. This rule continues in effect, unchanged by this resolution, and is reprinted below:

PAY-AS-YOU-GO POINT OF ORDER IN THE SENATE

See Section 207 of H. Con. Res. 68 (106th Cong. 1st Sess.)

(a) PURPOSES.—The Senate declares that it is essential to—

(1) ensure continued compliance with the balanced budget plan set forth in this resolution; and

(2) continue the pay-as-you-go enforcement system.

(b) POINT OF ORDER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any direct spending or revenue legislation that would increase the on-budget deficit or cause an on-budget deficit for any one of the three applicable time periods as measured in paragraphs (5) and (6).

(2) APPLICABLE TIME PERIODS.—For purposes of this subsection the term "applicable time period" means any one of the three following periods:

(A) The first year covered by the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget.

(B) The period of the first 5 fiscal years covered by the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget.

(C) The period of the 5 fiscal years following the first 5 fiscal years covered by the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget.

(3) DIRECT-SPENDING LEGISLATION.—For purposes of this subsection and except as provided in paragraph (4), the term "direct-spending legislation" means any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or Conference Agreement that affects direct spending as that term is defined by and inter-

preted for purposes of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(4) EXCLUSION.—For purposes of this subsection the terms "direct-spending legislation" and "revenue legislation" do not include—

(A) any concurrent resolution on the budget; or

(B) any provision of legislation that affects the full funding of, and continuation of, the deposit insurance guarantee commitment in effect on the date of enactment of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990.

(5) BASELINE.—Estimates prepared pursuant to this section shall—

(A) use the baseline used for the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget; and

(B) be calculated under the requirements of subsections (b) through (d) of section 257 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 for fiscal years beyond those covered by that concurrent resolution on the budget.

(6) PRIOR SURPLUS.—If direct spending or revenue legislation increases the on-budget deficit or causes an on-budget deficit when taken individually, then it must also increase the on-budget deficit or causes an on-budget deficit when taken together with all direct spending and revenue legislation enacted since the beginning of the calendar year not accounted for in the baseline under paragraph (5)(A), except that the direct spending or revenue effects resulting from legislation enacted pursuant to the reconciliation instructions included in that concurrent resolution on the budget shall not be available.

(c) WAIVER.—This section may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by the affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(d) APPEALS.—Appeals in the Senate from the decisions of the Chair relating to any provision of this section shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the appellant and the manager of the bill or joint resolution, as the case may be. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required in the Senate to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

(e) DETERMINATION OF BUDGET LEVELS.—For purposes of this section, the levels of new budget authority, outlays, and revenues for a fiscal year shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

(f) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 23 of House Concurrent Resolution 218 (103d Congress) is repealed.

(g) SUNSET.—Subsections (a) through (e) of this section shall expire September 30, 2002.

The Senate amendment assumes that the on-budget surplus be placed on the Senate's PAYGO scorecard. The baseline on-budget surpluses are shown on the table below:

(In billions of dollars)

	Fiscal year—										5 yr.	10 yr.
	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010		
Baseline on-budget surplus	26.509	54.330	77.487	105.636	132.475	197.085	248.281	290.469	348.599	410.089	396.437	1,890.961

RESERVE FUNDS

Reserve funds are special procedures for adjusting the levels in the budget resolution to accommodate specified classes of legislation. Usually the cost of these bills is not assumed in either the total revenue and spending levels or the appropriate committee's 302(a) allocations. In the absence of the adjustments, any reported bill would exceed

the reporting committees' allocations in violation of section 302(f) of the Budget Act, subjecting it to a point of order which could preclude the applicable House from considering the measure. The adjustments are usually automatically triggered by the consideration of a measure on the House or Senate floor. In the case of the reserve funds set forth herein, the adjustments may be made

at the discretion of the Budget Committee chairman of the House in which the measure is being considered and are subject to various limitations.

House resolution

Section 7 establishes several procedures to ensure that an amount equal to the revenue reduction assumed for tax relief is used for that purpose, or, if the tax legislation is not

enacted into law, used to reduce the public debt. Subsection (a) directs the Budget Committee chairman to reduce the aggregate by the amount that Federal revenues should be changed for fiscal year 2001 (\$150 billion over 5 years) to zero. In subsection (b), this level is then increased as each of the reconciliation bills is considered by Congress. Because only specified bills would cause the adjustment to be made, any other bill that would use the revenue for other purposes would be subject to a point of order.

Section 8 provides a reserve fund of \$50 billion that may be used for tax relief or debt reduction. Any part of this reserve fund used for tax relief would be in addition to the tax relief assumed in section 2(l). If the Committee on Ways and Means reports legislation reducing revenue by an amount in excess of its reconciliation instructions, subsection (b) allows the Budget Committee chairman to increase the aggregate level of revenue reduction by that amount. The total increase under this section, however, may not exceed \$5.155 billion in fiscal year 2001 and \$50 billion over 5 years.

Section 9 provides for an adjustment in the appropriate levels of the budget resolution if the Congressional Budget Office [CBO] releases a report projecting an increase in the on-budget surplus. If there is an increase in the surplus relative to the CBO estimates underlying the budget resolution, the Budget Committee chairman has the option to choose among any combination of the following: increasing the allocations to the authorizing committees; increasing the allocation of debt held by the public; and increasing the amount of revenue reduction. The sum of the adjustments may not exceed the projected increase in the surplus for fiscal year 2000 and for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005 included in the updated CBO report. Additionally, section 9 permits the Budget Committee chairman to direct the Committee on Ways and Means to report a bill reducing debt held by the public by an amount equal to any increase in the surplus for fiscal year 2000.

Section 10 establishes a reserve fund for certain Medicare-related legislation. The Budget Committee chairman has the option to increase the allocations of budget authority and outlays to the Committees on Ways and Means and Commerce, and the aggregates for legislation providing for Medicare reform and prescription drug coverage. The adjustments are in the amounts provided by the bill for the specified purpose, but not to exceed \$2 billion in budget authority and outlays in fiscal year 2001 and \$40 billion in budget authority and outlays over the 5-year period. The reserve fund assumes that this legislation will not be included in a reconciliation bill.

Section 11 establishes a reserve fund for agriculture for fiscal year 2000. The Budget Committee chairman is authorized to increase the allocations of budget authority and outlays to the Committee on Agriculture for legislation that provides income assistance to farmers and farm producers. The reserve fund is based on the assumption that the legislation will be reported by the Committee on Agriculture as a freestanding bill, rather than included in a supplemental appropriations bill, as has been the case in previous years. The chairman of the Budget Committee may make the adjustment by whatever amount of budget authority and resulting outlays are provided by the bill, but in no event may the adjustment exceed \$6 billion in fiscal year 2000. The resolution assumes all of the budget authority will be obligated and paid out of the Treasury in fiscal year 2000.

Section 12 provides a reserve fund for risk management or income support legislation

in fiscal year 2001 similar to that included in last year's budget resolution. The reserve fund authorizes the Budget Committee chairman to increase the allocations of budget authority and outlays to the Committee on Agriculture for legislation related to crop insurance or other income support measures. The adjustment is at the option of the chairman, but must be in the amount of budget authority and resulting outlays provided by the bill, but may not exceed \$1.355 billion in budget authority and \$595 million in outlays in fiscal year 2001, and \$8.539 billion in budget authority and \$7.223 billion in outlays over the 5-year period. The committee notes that a crop insurance bill, H.R. 2559, passed the House last year with a comparable adjustment in the fiscal year 2000 budget resolution (H. Con. Res 68) and has yet to be taken up by the Senate.

Section 13 sets forth the procedures for making adjustments pursuant to the reserve funds. Subsections (a)(1) and (2) provide that the adjustments are made only during the interval that the legislation is under consideration and do not take effect until the legislation is enacted. The treatment of these reserve funds is consistent with the treatment of adjustments for emergencies and other programs and initiatives under section 314 of the Budget Act.

Subsection (a)(3) provides that in order to make the adjustments for the reserve funds, the chairman must insert appropriate language in the Congressional Record.

Subsection (b) clarifies that any adjustments made under any of the reserve funds in the resolution have the same effect as if they were part of the original levels set forth in section 3. In other words, the adjusted levels, after they are made, are used to enforce points of order against legislation that is inconsistent with the budget resolution's allocations and aggregates.

Subsection (c) clarifies that the Committee on the Budget determines the estimates used to enforce points of order, as is the case for enforcing budget-related points of order pursuant to section 312 of the Budget Act.

Senate amendment

Section 202: Reserve Fund for Medicare. The Senate amendment contains language in section 202 establishing a two-part reserve fund for Medicare legislation.

Subsection (a) permits the chairman of the Committee on the Budget to adjust the section 302(a) allocation to the Committee on Finance, and the aggregates and other appropriate budgetary levels for legislation that provides a Medicare prescription drug benefit if the cost of the legislation does not exceed \$20 billion over the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2003 and the legislation does not cause an on-budget deficit in any of these years.

Subsection (b) provides that if the Committee on Finance fails to report such legislation prior to September 1, 2000, the adjustments permitted by subsection (a) shall be made with respect to any legislation considered in the Senate containing a prescription drug benefit.

Subsection (c) permits the chairman of the Committee on the Budget to adjust the section 302(a) allocation to the Committee on Finance and the spending aggregates for legislation which provides an additional \$20 billion for fiscal years 2004 and 2005 if the Committee on Finance reports legislation that extends the solvency of the Medicare Hospital Insurance trust fund without the use of new subsidies from the general fund, without decreasing beneficiaries' access to health care, and excludes the cost of extending and modifying the prescription drug benefit crafted pursuant to the first part of the re-

serve fund. The Committee assumes that Medicare reform efforts will ensure adequate reimbursement for Medicare providers. The allocation of this \$20 billion cannot cause an on-budget deficit in either 2004 or 2005.

Section 203: Reserve Fund for the Stabilization of Payments to Counties in Support of Education. The Senate amendment contains language providing a reserve fund that would allow the chairman of the Committee on the Budget to adjust the section 302(a) allocation to the Energy and Natural Resources Committee for legislation providing additional mandatory spending for the stabilization of receipt-based payments to counties that support school and road systems and also provides a portion of those payments toward local investments in Federal lands within those counties. Adjustments may also be made for amendments that bring the reported legislation into compliance with the terms of this reserve fund. The reserve fund requires that the committee report this legislation and that the cost shall not exceed \$200,000,000 in the first year and not more than \$1,100,000,000 for fiscal years 2001 through 2005.

Section 204: Reserve Fund for Agriculture. The Senate amendment contains language providing a reserve fund that would allow the chairman of the Committee on the Budget to adjust the section 302 allocation to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry for legislation providing for additional mandatory spending for assistance for producers of program crops and specialty crops, enhancement for agriculture conservation programs, and perhaps other programs within the committee's jurisdiction. The reserve fund can only be triggered if the committee reports legislation to the Senate on or before June 29, 2000. Adjustments may also be made for amendments that bring the reported legislation into compliance with the terms of this reserve fund. The cost of such legislation shall not exceed \$5,500,000,000 for fiscal year 2000; \$1,640,000,000 for fiscal year 2001; and \$3,000,000,000 for fiscal years 2001 through 2005.

Section 205: Tax Reduction Reserve Fund in the Senate. The Senate amendment contains language providing a reserve fund that allows the chairman of the Committee on the Budget to adjust the spending and revenue aggregates for legislation that reduces revenues as long as the legislation does not cause an on-budget deficit for the first year or the sum of the 5 years covered by this resolution.

Section 206: Mechanism for Additional Debt Reduction. If either or both of the tax reconciliation bills envisioned by section 104 of the Senate amendment or the Medicare/Prescription drug legislation envisioned by section 202 of the Senate amendment do not become law (because they are never enacted by the Congress or the President vetoes the measures), the Conference Agreement contains language which would allow the chairman of the Budget Committee to reduce the balances available on the Senate's pay-go scorecard and adjust the aggregates and committee allocations to prevent these "reconciled" or "reserved" amounts from being used for anything other than reduction of debt held by the public. In addition, the debt held by the public levels shown in section 101(6) of this resolution will be reduced by those same amounts to make clear that these funds are dedicated to debt reduction.

Section 214: Reserve Fund to Foster the Health of Children with Disabilities and the Employment and Independence of Their Families. The Senate amendment contains language that provides a reserve fund that would allow the chairman of the Committee on the Budget to adjust the section 302(a) allocation to the Committee on Finance and

the spending aggregate for legislation which facilitates children with disabilities receiving needed health care at home while still allowing their families to become or remain employed. The reserve fund can only be triggered if the committee reports legislation to the Senate. Adjustments may also be made for amendments that bring the reported legislation into compliance with the terms of this reserve fund. This will permit such legislation to make use of any on-budget surpluses. However, the cost of such legislation shall not exceed \$50,000,000 for fiscal year 2001; and \$300,000,000 for fiscal years 2001 through 2005.

Section 216: Reserve Fund for Military Retiree Health Care. The Senate amendment contains language providing a reserve fund that would allow the chairman of the Committee on the Budget to adjust the section 302(a) allocation to the Committee on Armed Services, and other budgetary aggregates and limits, for legislation that funds improvements to health care programs for military retirees and their dependents in the fiscal year 2001 Department of Defense authorization legislation. The reserve fund can only be triggered if the committee reports such legislation to the Senate. The cost of such legislation may not cause an on-budget deficit for fiscal year 2001 or the sum of fiscal years 2001 through 2005.

Section 217: Reserve Fund for Early Learning and Parent Support Programs. The Senate amendment contains language that provides a reserve fund that would allow the chairman of the Committee on the Budget in the House and Senate to adjust the section 302(a) allocation to the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions in the Senate, and other budgetary aggregates and limits, for legislation that improves opportunities at the local level for early learning, brain development, and school readiness and offers support programs for their families. The cost of such legislation may not cause an on-budget deficit and may not exceed \$8.5 billion in budget authority for the sum of fiscal years 2001 through 2005.

Conference agreement

Section 211 of the Conference Agreement establishes a procedure to ensure that if any of the reconciliation bills pursuant to sections 103(a) and 104, Medicare reform/prescription drug bills pursuant to sections 214 and 215, and other freestanding tax bills are not enacted into law, then the amount of the surplus reserved for these bills will be used to reduce debt. This will be displayed by permitting the chairmen to reduce the advisory levels of debt held by the public. The chairmen of the Budget Committees are authorized to increase the revenue aggregates by the difference between the assumed tax cut and the amount of any tax cuts actually enacted after the date of the adoption of this resolution. In the same fashion, each Chairman may reduce the spending aggregates by the difference between the amount assumed for Medicare reform/prescription drugs and the amount of spending provided by any such enacted legislation. If any changes in the aggregates are made under this section, then the Senate Budget Committee chairman is authorized to make the appropriate changes in the Senate's PAYGO balances. This section would also reduce any adjustment made under section 213 to the extent that the adjustments exceed the costs of enacted legislation as of the date the Chairmen make the adjustments under this section.

Section 212 of the Conference Agreement establishes a reserve fund to accommodate an additional \$25 billion in tax relief or debt reduction. This section applies to both the

House and the Senate. Under this section, the Budget Committee chairman of the appropriate House may adjust the revenue aggregate by the amount the legislation reduces revenue in excess of the reconciled \$11.6 billion in fiscal year 2001 and \$150 billion over 5 years (when all other legislation reducing revenues enacted after the adoption of this concurrent resolution has been taken into account), but not to exceed the \$1 billion in fiscal year 2001 and \$25 billion in fiscal years 2001 through 2005. This amount is in addition to any adjustment triggered by CBO's update to The Budget and Economic Outlook referred to in section 213.

Section 213 of the Conference Agreement establishes a reserve fund to accommodate additional tax relief or debt reduction if the estimates of the projected on-budget surplus increases. It applies to both the House and the Senate. The Budget Committee chairman of each House may increase the aggregate level of revenue reduction, and adjust the reconciliation instructions accordingly, by an amount not to exceed the projected increase in the on-budget surplus as estimated in the next update to The Budget and Economic Outlook published by the Congressional Budget Office [CBO]. This increase is relative to the corresponding levels as reported in The Budget and Economic Outlook published by CBO in March 2000 which underlie this budget resolution. If these additional surpluses are not applied to additional tax reduction, the level of debt held by the public will be automatically reduced. If CBO projects an increase in the surplus for fiscal year 2000, this section authorizes the House Budget chairman to reduce the debt levels and direct the Committee on Ways and Means to report a bill reducing debt held by the public by the amount of the increase in the surplus for that fiscal year.

Section 214 of the Conference Agreement establishes a reserve fund for legislation that provides for Medicare reform and prescription drug coverage. This reserve fund applies only in the House. The Budget Committee chairman is authorized to increase the appropriate allocations of budget authority and outlays to the House Ways and Means Committee and the House Commerce Committee, and aggregates if necessary, by the amount of budget authority and outlays provided by the measure for the specified purpose. In no event may the amount of the adjustment exceed \$2.0 billion in budget authority and outlays in fiscal year 2001 and \$40 billion in budget authority and outlays over 5 years.

Section 215 of the Conference Agreement establishes a reserve fund for Medicare in the Senate. It contains language which establishes a two-part reserve fund for Medicare legislation.

Subsection (a) permits the chairman of the Committee on the Budget to adjust the section 302(a) allocation to the Committee on Finance, and the aggregates and other appropriate budgetary levels for legislation which provides a Medicare prescription drug benefit if the cost of the legislation does not exceed \$20 billion over the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005 and the legislation does not cause an on-budget deficit in any of these years.

Subsection (b) permits the chairman of the Committee on the Budget to adjust the section 302(a) allocation to the Committee on Finance and other aggregates for legislation which provides \$40 billion for fiscal years 2001 through 2005 if the Committee on Finance reports legislation which improves the solvency of the Medicare program without the use of new subsidies from the general fund and improves access to prescription drugs (or continues access provided under subsection (a)). The amount provided under

this subsection will be reduced by any amount provided for legislation considered in the Senate under subsection (a). The allocation of this \$40 billion may not cause an on-budget deficit in any fiscal year.

Section 216 of the Conference Agreement establishes a reserve fund for legislation that provides assistance for producers of program and specialty crops. It applies in both the House and the Senate. The Budget Committee chairman of the appropriate House is authorized to increase the 302(a) allocations for fiscal years 2000 and 2001 for the House Committee on Agriculture and the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry by the amount of budget authority and resulting outlays provided by the measure for the specified purpose. In no event may the amount of the adjustment exceed \$5.5 billion in budget authority and outlays in fiscal year 2000, and 1.64 billion in budget authority and outlays in fiscal year 2001. The conferees have based this reserve fund on the assumption that it will be considered as part of a freestanding bill reported by the authorizing committees rather than incorporated into an appropriations measure.

Section 217 of the Conference Agreement establishes a reserve fund to accommodate legislation for health programs designed to allow children with disabilities to obtain access to home health services and enable their parents to seek employment. This reserve fund applies to both the House and Senate. The Budget Committee chairman of the appropriate House may make adjustments to the 302(a) allocations of the House Commerce Committee and the Senate Finance Committee by the amount of budget authority and outlays provided by the bill. In no event may the amount of the adjustment exceed \$25 million in budget authority and outlays in fiscal year 2001 and \$150 million in budget authority and outlays over 5 years.

Section 218 of the Conference Agreement establishes a reserve fund for legislation that improves military retiree health care programs. It applies in both the House and Senate. The Budget Committee chairman of the appropriate House may increase the 302(a) allocations for the House and Senate Committees on Armed Services by the amount of budget authority and outlays provided by the bill for the specified purpose. In no event may the amount of the adjustment exceed \$50 million in budget authority and outlays in fiscal year 2001 and \$400 million in budget authority and outlays over 5 years. In addition, the chairman may not make an adjustment if the enactment of the legislation would cause an on-budget deficit in fiscal year 2001 or the 5 year period.

Section 219 of the Conference Agreement establishes a new reserve fund for legislation that accelerates enrollment of uninsured children in Medicaid and the State Children's Health Insurance Programs or provides Medicaid coverage for women diagnosed with breast or cervical cancer through the screening programs of the Centers for Disease Control. It applies in both the House and the Senate. The Budget Committee chairman of the appropriate House is authorized to increase the 302(a) allocations to the House Commerce Committee and the Senate Finance Committee by the amount of budget authority and outlays provided by the bill. In no event may the amount of the adjustment exceed \$50 million in budget authority and outlays for fiscal year 2001 and \$250 million in budget authority and outlays for the 5 year period.

Section 220 of the Conference Agreement establishes a reserve fund for legislation providing for stabilization of payments to counties in support of education. It applies in both the House and Senate. The Budget Committee chairman of the appropriate House

may increase the 302(a) allocations for the House Committees on Agriculture and Resources and the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources by the amount of budget authority and outlays provided by the bill for the specified purpose. In no event may the amount of the adjustment exceed \$200 million in budget authority and outlays in fiscal year 2001 and \$1.1 billion in budget authority and outlays over 5 years. In addition, the section requires that, for the adjustment to be made, the legislation must provide for the stabilization of receipt-based payments to counties that support school and road systems and must also provide for a portion of those payments to be dedicated toward local investments in Federal lands within the counties.

Section 221 of the Conference Agreement is similar to the language included in the Senate amendment which provides for a reserve fund that allows the Senate chairman of the Committee on the Budget to adjust the spending and revenue aggregate for legislation that reduces revenues as long as the legislation does not cause an on-budget deficit for the first year or the sum of the 5 years covered by this resolution. The House has standing authority to consider such legislation under Section 302(g)(1)(B) of the Budget Act.

Section 222 of the Conference Agreement sets forth the procedures by which the Budget Committee chairman may make the adjustments for the reserve funds established under this subtitle. Subsection (a) clarifies that the adjustments are made only when the measure is considered and become permanent only when the measure is enacted. Subsection (b) provides that the adjusted levels are used to enforce subsequent budget-related points of order. Subsection (c) reiterates the role of the Budget Committee in advising the presiding officer of the House regarding the budgetary effects of legislation subject to such points of order.

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Under 301(b)(4) of the Budget Act and its standing authority under the U.S. Constitution, the budget resolution includes enforcement-related provisions other than points of order and reserve funds. These provisions include various directives relating to scoring conventions and a reaffirmation of the rule making authority of the U.S. Congress.

House resolution

No house provisions are included in this section.

Senate amendment

Section 211: Prohibition on the use of Federal Reserve Surpluses. The Senate amendment contains language that is designed to ensure that transfers from non-budgetary governmental entities such as the Federal Reserve banks shall not be used to offset increased on-budget spending when such transfers produce no real budgetary effects. It has long been the view of the Committee on the Budget that transfers of Federal Reserve surpluses to the Treasury are not valid offsets for increased spending. Nonetheless, such transfers have been legislated in the past—as recently as the fall of 1999. The purpose of this section is to establish a scoring rule to make clear that such transfers will not be taken into account when determining compliance with the various Budget Act and Senate pay-go points of order.

Section 212: Reaffirming the Prohibition on the use of Revenue Offsets for Discre-

tionary Spending. The Senate amendment contains language that is intended to emphasize the longstanding view of the Congressional Budget Committees and the Congressional Budget Office that changes in revenues shall not be scored in appropriations legislation. This means that tax increases shall not be used as offsets for increased discretionary spending. The Committee on the Budget finds it necessary to set this forth in this budget resolution in response to the President once again asserting in his fiscal year 2001 budget that an increase in tobacco taxes can be used to offset huge increases in discretionary spending.

Section 213: Application and Effect of Changes in Allocations and Aggregates. The Senate amendment contains language that is similar to the language found in section 208 of the Conference Agreement on the fiscal year 2000 budget resolution. This language clarifies how and when any adjustments to the allocations or aggregates or pay-go balances permitted by the various reserve funds contained in the Conference Agreement may be made.

Section 215: Exercise of Rule making Powers. The Senate amendment contains language regarding the rule making authority of each of the Houses of Congress.

Conference Agreement

Section 231 of the Conference Agreement, which applies to the House only, reflects the Senate treatment for function 650, which consists of on-budget payments by the Treasury Department to the OASDI Trust Funds for income taxes on Social Security benefits. In a significant departure from the House bill and from conference reports since 1991, the function 650 levels do not include the administrative expenses that were included in the House resolution and in recent conference reports in previous years. These expenses were not included in the function out of a belated recognition that such expenses were taken off budget by the Budget Enforcement Act [BEA] of 1990. Section 13301 of that Act provided, in part:

“(A) EXCLUSION OF SOCIAL SECURITY FROM ALL BUDGETS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the receipts and disbursements of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Disability Insurance Trust Fund shall not be counted as new budget authority, outlays, receipts, or deficit or surplus for purposes of * * * (2) the congressional budget”.

Nevertheless, Congress continued to include administrative expenses for Social Security in function 650 because they were clearly discretionary—that is, they are controlled through the annual appropriations process. Because section 302(a) of the Budget Act provides that the allocation must be “consistent” with the functional levels and aggregates, it was originally considered necessary to include these amounts in the function 650 levels and the aggregate.

The other reason for changing the treatment of Social Security is that the Congressional Budget Office [CBO] already excludes Social Security administrative expenses from its budgetary projections of on-budget revenue, spending, and surplus or deficit levels. As a consequence, CBO projections have not been comparable to the levels underlying the House and Senate budget resolutions. This has caused confusion among Members of Congress who have sought to make comparisons between CBO's projections and the levels set forth in the budget resolution.

To comply with the BEA and standardize congressional scoring for Social Security, section 231 of the conference report provides clear authority to include administrative amounts in the 302(a) allocation to the Appropriations Committee, even though such levels will no longer be included in the on-budget totals and function levels.

Subsection (b) clarifies that any determination under section 302(f) of the Budget Act include any amounts provided in the measure for discretionary administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration.

Section 232 of the Conference Agreement retains the language of section 211 of the Senate amendment. It contains language that is designed to ensure that transfers from non-budgetary governmental entities such as the Federal Reserve banks shall not be used to offset increased on-budget spending when such transfers produce no real budgetary effects. It has long been the view of the Committee on the Budget that transfers of Federal Reserve surpluses to the Treasury are not valid offsets for increased spending. Nonetheless, such transfers have been legislated in the past—as recently as the fall of 1999. The purpose of this section is to establish a scoring rule to make clear that such transfers will not be taken into account when determining compliance with the various Budget Act and Senate pay-go points of order.

Section 233 of the Conference Agreement is similar to section 212 of the Senate amendment. It contains language that is intended to emphasize the longstanding view of the Congressional Budget Committees and the Congressional Budget Office that changes in revenues included in appropriations legislation shall nonetheless be scored on the PAYGO scorecard. This means that tax increases shall not be used as offsets for increased discretionary spending. The Committees on the Budget find it necessary to set this forth in this budget resolution in response to the President once again asserting in his fiscal year 2001 budget that an increase in taxes can be used to offset increases in discretionary spending.

Section 234 of the Conference Agreement adopts the language contained in section 215 of the Senate amendment. This provision restates that the rules set forth in this budget resolution are considered a part of the rules of each House or the House to which they specifically apply. This section further recognizes the constitutional right of each House to change provisions of the resolution through subsequent rule making.

ECONOMIC ASSUMPTIONS

Section 301(g)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act requires that the joint explanatory statement accompanying a conference report on a budget resolution set forth the common economic assumptions upon which the joint statement and conference report are based. The conference agreement is built on the economic assumptions developed by the Congressional Budget Office [CBO] and presented in CBO's *The Budget and Economic Outlook: Fiscal Years 2001-2010*.

House Resolution.—CBO's economic assumptions were used.

Senate Amendment.—CBO's economic assumptions were used.

Conference Agreement.—CBO's economic assumptions were used.

ECONOMIC ASSUMPTIONS OF THE BUDGET RESOLUTION

[By calendar years]

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Real GDP (percent year over year)	3.3	3.1	2.8	2.6	2.6	2.7

ECONOMIC ASSUMPTIONS OF THE BUDGET RESOLUTION—Continued

[By calendar years]

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
GDP Price Index (percent year over year)	1.6	1.6	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7
Consumer Price Inflation (percent year over year)	2.5	2.4	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5
Unemployment Rate (annual rate)	4.1	4.2	4.4	4.7	4.8	5.0
3-month Treasury Bills Rate (annual rate)	5.4	5.6	5.3	4.9	4.8	4.8
10-year Treasury Note rate (annual rate)	6.3	6.4	6.1	5.8	5.7	5.7
Corporate (Book) Profits (percent of GDP)	8.6	8.2	7.8	7.6	7.4	7.3
Wage and Salary (percent of GDP)	48.8	48.8	48.9	48.9	48.9	48.9

SENSES OF THE HOUSE, SENATE AND CONGRESS
House resolution

The House budget resolution contains the following senses of the House or Congress that have no legal force but reflect the Congress' views on a variety of budget-related issues. The section numbers and section headings of these reserve funds are as follows:

Section 5(c). Sense of Congress endorsing legislation establishing a limit on debt held by the public.

Section 8(b). Sense of Congress on additional health-related tax relief.

Section 8(c). Sense of Congress on Federal employees' benefit package.

Section 14. Sense of Congress on waste, fraud and abuse.

Section 15. Sense of Congress on providing additional dollars to the classroom.

Section 16. Sense of Congress regarding emergency spending.

Section 17. Sense of the House on estimates of the impact of regulations on the private sector.

Section 18. Sense of the House on biennial budgeting.

Section 19. Sense of Congress on access to health insurance and preserving home health services for all medicare beneficiaries.

Section 20. Sense of Congress regarding Medicare+Choice programs/reimbursement rates.

Section 21. Sense of the House on directing the Internal Revenue Service to accept negative numbers in farm income averaging.

Section 22. Sense of the House regarding the stabilization of certain Federal Payments to States, counties, and boroughs.

Section 23. Sense of Congress on the importance of the National Science Foundation.

Section 24. Sense of Congress regarding skilled nursing facilities.

Section 25. Sense of Congress on special education.

Section 26. Sense of Congress on assumed funding levels for special education.

Section 27. Sense of Congress on a federal employee pay raise.

Section 28. Sense of Congress regarding HCFA draft guidelines.

Section 29. Sense of Congress on asset-building for the working poor.

Section 30. Sense of Congress on the importance of supporting the Nation's emergency first-responders

Senate amendment

The Senate amendment included the following sense of the Senate or sense of the Congress provisions:

Section 301. Sense of the Senate on controlling and eliminating the growing international problem of tuberculosis.

Section 302. Sense of the Senate on increased funding for the child care and development block grant.

Section 303. Sense of the Senate on tax relief for college tuition paid and for interest paid on student loans.

Section 304. Sense of the Senate on increased funding for the National Institutes of Health.

Section 305. Sense of the Senate supporting funding levels in Educational Opportunities Act.

Section 306. Sense of the Senate on additional budgetary resources.

Section 307. Sense of the Senate regarding the inadequacy of the payments for skilled nursing care.

Section 308. Sense of the Senate on the CARA programs.

Section 309. Sense of the Senate on Veteran's Medical Care.

Section 310. Sense of the Senate on Impact Aid.

Section 311. Sense of the Senate on funding for increased acreage under the Conservation Reserve Program and the Wetlands Reserve Program.

Section 312. Sense of the Senate on tax simplification.

Section 313. Sense of the Senate on anti-trust enforcement by the Department of Justice and Federal Trade Commission regarding agriculture mergers, and anti-competitive activity.

Section 314. Sense of the Senate regarding fair markets for American farmers.

Section 315. Sense of the Senate on women and social security reform.

Section 316. Protection of battered women and children.

Section 317. Use of False Claims Act in combating Medicare fraud.

Section 318. Sense of the Senate regarding the National Guard.

Section 319. Sense of the Senate regarding military readiness.

Section 320. Sense of the Senate on compensation for the Chinese Embassy bombing in Belgrade.

Section 321. Sense of the Senate supporting funding of digital opportunity initiatives.

Section 322. Sense of the Senate regarding immunization funding.

Section 323. Sense of the Senate regarding tax credits for small businesses providing health insurance to low-income employees.

Section 324. Sense of the Senate on funding for criminal justice.

Section 325. Sense of the Senate regarding the Pell Grant.

Section 326. Sense of the Senate regarding comprehensive public education reform.

Section 327. Sense of the Senate on providing adequate funding for United States International Leadership.

Section 328. Sense of the Senate concerning the HIV/AIDS crisis.

Section 329. Sense of the Senate regarding tribal colleges.

Section 330. Sense of the Senate to provide relief from the marriage penalty.

Section 331. Sense of the Senate on Federal fuel taxes.

Section 332. Sense of the Senate on the internal combustion engine.

Section 333. Sense of the Senate regarding a national background check system for long-term care workers.

Section 334. Sense of the Senate concerning the price of prescription drugs.

Section 335. Sense of the Senate against Federal funding of smoke shops.

Section 336. Sense of the Senate regarding the need to reduce gun violence in America.

Section 337. Sense of the Senate supporting additional funding for fiscal year 2001 for medical care for our Nation's veterans.

Section 338. Sense of the Senate regarding medical care for veterans.

Section 339. Sense of the Senate concerning investment of Social Security trust funds.

Section 340. Sense of the Senate regarding digital opportunity.

Section 341. Sense of the Senate regarding Medicare prescription drugs.

Section 342. Sense of the Senate concerning funding for new education programs.

Section 343. Sense of the Senate regarding enforcement of Federal firearm laws.

Section 344. Sense of the Senate regarding the census.

Section 345. Sense of the Senate that any increase in the minimum wage should be accompanied by tax relief for small businesses.

Section 346. Sense of the Senate concerning the minimum wage.

Section 347. Sense of Congress regarding funding for the participation of members of the uniformed services in the Thrift Savings Plan.

Section 348. Sense of the Senate concerning protecting the Social Security trust funds.

Section 349. Sense of the Senate concerning regulation of tobacco products.

Section 350. Sense of the Senate regarding after school programs.

Section 351. Sense of the Senate regarding cash balances pension plan conversions.

Section 352. Sense of the Senate concerning uninsured and low-income individuals in medically underserved communities.

Section 353. Sense of the Senate concerning fiscal year 2001 funding for the United States Coast Guard.

Conference Agreement

The Conference Agreement contains the following non-binding language that expresses the will or intent of either or both Houses of the Congress on a variety of budget-related issues:

The Conference Agreement contains the following senses of the House:

Section 311. Sense of the House on waste, fraud and abuse.

Section 312. Sense of the House regarding emergency spending.

Section 313. Sense of the House on estimates of the impact of regulations on the private sector.

Section 314. Sense of the House on biennial budgeting.

Section 315. Sense of the House on access to health insurance and preserving home health services for all medicare beneficiaries.

Section 316. Sense of the House regarding Medicare+Choice programs/reimbursement rates.

Section 317. Sense of the House on directing the Internal Revenue Service to accept negative numbers in farm income averaging.

Section 318. Sense of the House on the importance of the National Science Foundation.

Section 319. Sense of the House regarding skilled nursing facilities.

Section 320. Sense of the House on special education.

Section 321. Sense of the House regarding HCFA draft guidelines.

Section 322. Sense of the House on asset-building for the working poor.

Section 323. Sense of the House on the importance of supporting the Nation's emergency first-responders.

Section 324. Sense of the House on additional health-related tax relief.

The Conference Agreement contains the following senses of the Senate:

Section 331. Sense of the Senate supporting funding levels in Educational Opportunities Act.

Section 332. Sense of the Senate on additional budgetary resources.

Section 333. Sense of the Senate regarding the inadequacy of the payments for skilled nursing care.

Section 334. Sense of the Senate on veteran's medical care.

Section 335. Sense of the Senate on Impact Aid.

Section 336. Sense of the Senate on tax simplification.

Section 337. Sense of the Senate on anti-trust enforcement by the Department of Justice and Federal Trade Commission regarding agriculture mergers, and anti-competitive activity.

Section 338. Sense of the Senate regarding fair markets for American farmers.

Section 339. Sense of the Senate on women and social security reform.

Section 340. Use of False Claims Act in combating Medicare fraud.

Section 341. Sense of the Senate regarding the National Guard.

Section 342. Sense of the Senate regarding military readiness.

Section 343. Sense of the Senate supporting funding of digital opportunity initiatives.

Section 344. Sense of the Senate on funding for criminal justice.

Section 345. Sense of the Senate regarding comprehensive public education reform.

Section 346. Sense of the Senate on providing adequate funding for United States international leadership.

Section 347. Sense of the Senate concerning the HIV/AIDS crisis.

Section 348. Sense of the Senate regarding tribal colleges.

Section 349. Sense of the Senate to provide relief from the marriage penalty.

Section 350. Sense of the Senate on Federal fuel taxes.

Section 351. Sense of the Senate concerning the price of prescription drugs.

Section 352. Sense of the Senate against Federal funding of smoke shops.

Section 353. Sense of the Senate concerning investment of Social Security trust funds.

Section 354. Sense of the Senate regarding Medicare prescription drugs.

Section 355. Sense of the Senate concerning funding for new education programs.

Section 356. Sense of the Senate regarding enforcement of Federal firearm laws.

Section 357. Sense of the Senate that any increase in the minimum wage should be accompanied by tax relief for small businesses.

Section 358. Sense of the Senate regarding funding for the participation of members of the uniformed services in the Thrift Savings Plan.

Section 359. Sense of the Senate concerning uninsured and low-income individuals in medically underserved communities.

The Conference Agreement contains the following senses of Congress:

Section 302. Sense of Congress on providing additional dollars to the classroom.

Section 303. Sense of Congress on graduate medical education for Children's Hospital.

PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT IN THE HOUSE

Rule XXIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives provides a procedure for changing the statutory limits on the public debt. This rule, however, was waived as part

of the special rule providing for the consideration of H. Con. Res. 290 (H.Res.106-535).

JOHN R. KASICH,
SAXBY CHAMBLISS,
CHRISTOPHER SHAYS,
Managers on Part of the House.

PETE DOMENICI,
CHUCK GRASSLEY,
C.S. BOND,
SLADE GORTON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

2255

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington) at 10 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H. CON. RES. 290, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 2001

Mr. GOSS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-578) on the resolution (H. Res. 475) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 290) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2001, revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2000, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2002 through 2005, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3615, RURAL LOCAL BROADCAST SIGNAL ACT

Mr. GOSS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-579) on the resolution (H. Res. 475) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3615) to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 to ensure improved access to the signals of local television stations by multichannel video providers to all households which desire such service in unserved and underserved rural areas by December 31, 2006, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CUMMINGS (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MCNULTY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. KLECZKA, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. CROWLEY, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. HOLT, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. MENENDEZ, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. BERMAN, for 5 minutes, today.
Mrs. LOWEY, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. SHERMAN, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. TIERNEY, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. MCGOVERN, for 5 minutes, today.
Mrs. MALONEY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BAIRD, for 5 minutes, today.
Mrs. NAPOLITANO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. ESHOO, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KNOLLENBERG) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. WELDON of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PEASE, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RADANOVICH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, for 5 minutes, April 13.

Mr. HORN, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at their own request) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SWEENEY, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 13, 2000, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

7073. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a draft bill, "To amend the United States Grain Standards Act to extend the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to collect fees, to

extend the authorization of appropriations for such Act, and to improve the administration of such Act"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

7074. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting the proposed transfer of the battleship ex-NEW JERSEY (BB 62) to the Home Port Alliance of Camden, New Jersey, a non-profit organization; to the Committee on Armed Services.

7075. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a draft bill, "To authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to instruct the United States Executive Director to vote to approve the use of the International Monetary Fund of all earnings on the investment of the profits on non-public gold sales for the purpose of providing debt relief under the enhanced Heavily Indebted Poor Countries ("HIPC") Initiative and to authorize appropriations for the United States contribution to the HIPC Trust Fund, administered by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development"; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

7076. A letter from the Executive Director, Emergency Oil and Gas Guaranteed Loan Board, transmitting the Board's final rule—Loan Guarantee Decision; Availability of Environmental Information; Correction (RIN: 3003-ZA00) received February 15, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

7077. A letter from the Executive Director, Emergency Steel Guarantee Loan Board, transmitting the Board's final rule—Loan Guarantee Decision; Application Deadline (RIN: 3003-ZA00) received February 15, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

7078. A letter from the Executive Director, Emergency Steel Guarantee Loan Board, transmitting the Board's final rule—Loan Guarantee Decision; Availability of Environmental Information; Correction (RIN: 3003-ZA00) received February 15, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

7079. A letter from the Executive Director, Emergency Steel Guarantee Loan Board, transmitting the Board's final rule—Emergency Steel Guarantee Loan Board Amendments (RIN: 3003-ZA00) received February 15, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

7080. A letter from the Managing Director, Federal Housing Finance Board, transmitting the 2000 Base Salary Structures; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

7081. A letter from the General Counsel, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Safety Standard for Bunk Beds—received February 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7082. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans State: Approval of Revisions to Kentucky State Implementation Plan [KY-109-1-200007a; FRL-6533-2] received February 8, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7083. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Extending Operating Permits Program Iterim Approval Expiration Dates [FRL-6535-2] received February 8, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7084. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report

on the status of efforts to obtain Iraq's compliance with the resolutions adopted by the U.N. Security Council, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1541; (H. Doc. No. 106—223); to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed.

7085. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a copy of Presidential Determination No. 2000-12, authorizing the furnishing of military assistance to the United Nations for purposes of supporting East Timor's transition to independence, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2601(c)(3); to the Committee on International Relations.

7086. A letter from the Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a report on the audit of the American Red Cross for the year ending June 30, 1999, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 6; to the Committee on International Relations.

7087. A letter from the Under Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting a report that the Department of Commerce has processed the last remaining satellite export license application that was in its queue when the jurisdiction for satellites was retransferred to the Department of State in March 15, 1999; to the Committee on International Relations.

7088. A letter from the Executive Director, Committee For Purchase From People Who Are Blind Or Severely Disabled, transmitting the Committee's final rule—Procurement List: Additions and Deletions—received February 16, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

7089. A letter from the Executive Director, District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority, transmitting the General Purpose Financial Statements and Independent Auditor's Report for the fiscal year ended September 30, 1999; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7090. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Agreements with Institutions of Higher Education, Hospital, and Other Non-Profit Organizations—received February 8, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

7091. A letter from the Chief Financial Officer, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting the revised Annual Performance Plan for the Export-Import Bank, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 635g(a); to the Committee on Government Reform.

7092. A letter from the Chief Financial Officer, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting the Bank's Annual Management Report for the year ended September 30, 1999, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7093. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting a copy of the Corporation's Annual Report for calendar year 1999, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 1827(a); to the Committee on Government Reform.

7094. A letter from the Administrator, Office of Federal Procurement Policy, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting a report on the three categories of Cost Accounting Standards (CAS) coverage known as "full," "modified," and "FAR" (Federal Acquisition Regulation) coverage; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7095. A letter from the Board Members, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting a copy of the annual report in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act during the calendar year 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Reform.

7096. A letter from the Deputy Chief, National Forest System, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a detailed boundary map for the East Fork Jemez and Pecos Rivers in New Mexico, pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 1274; to the Committee on Resources.

7097. A letter from the Chairman, Naval Sea Cadet Corps, transmitting the Annual Audit Report of the Corps for the year 1999, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 1101(39) and 1103; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7098. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Establishment of Class E, Glendive, MT [Airspace Docket No. 99-ANM-08] received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7099. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting the 1999 Annual Report of the Visiting Committee on Advanced Technology of the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), U.S. Department of Commerce, pursuant to Public Law 100-418, section 5131(b) (102 Stat. 1443); to the Committee on Science.

7100. A letter from the Director, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Department of Commerce, transmitting a report on donated educationally useful Federal equipment; to the Committee on Science.

7101. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Analysis, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting a draft bill entitled, "Veterans' Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act of 2000"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

7102. A letter from the Chairman, International Trade Commission, transmitting a draft bill, "To provide authorization of appropriations for the United States International Trade Commission for fiscal year 2001"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7103. A letter from the Commissioner, Social Security Administration, transmitting a draft bill to provide additional safeguards for the Social Security and Supplemental Security Income beneficiaries with representative payees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7104. A letter from the Director, Congressional Budget Office, transmitting the CBO's Sequestration Preview Report for FY 2001, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. section 904(b); jointly to the Committees on Appropriations and the Budget.

7105. A letter from the Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's annual report on the Automotive Technology Development Program, Fiscal Year 1997, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 5914; jointly to the Committees on Science and Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LINDER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 472. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3439) to prohibit the Federal Communications Commission from establishing rules authorizing the operation of new, low power FM radio stations (Rept. 106-575). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LINDER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 473. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4199) to terminate the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (Rept. 106-576). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. KASICH: Committee of Conference. Conference report on House Concurrent Resolution 290. Resolution establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2001, revising the

congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2000, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2002 through 2005 (Rept. 106-577). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. GOSS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 474. Resolution waiving points of order against conference report to accompany the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 290) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2001, revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2000, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2002 through 2005 (Rept. 106-578). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LINDER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 475. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3615) to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 to ensure improved access to the signals of local television stations by multichannel video providers to all households which desire such service in unserved and underserved rural areas by December 31, 2006 (Rept. 106-579). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. PITTS (for himself, Mr. OSE, and Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE):

H.R. 4245. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income payments made under Federal Government programs for the repayment of student loans of members of the Armed Forces of the United States and the National Health Service Corps; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS of Virginia (for himself, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, and Mr. ROGAN):

H.R. 4246. A bill to encourage the secure disclosure and protected exchange of information about cyber security problems, solutions, test practices and test results, and related matters in connection with critical infrastructure protection; to the Committee on Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BATEMAN (for himself and Mr. UNDERWOOD) (both by request):

H.R. 4247. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2001 for certain maritime programs of the Department of Transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CALVERT (for himself, Mr. REYES, Mrs. BONO, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. BACA, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. POMBO, Mr. WOLF, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. DREIER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. HERGER, Mr. GARY MILLER of California, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. HORN, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. PORTER, Mr. MICA, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. DANNER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. BONILLA,

Mr. WAMP, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. GOSS, Mr. ROGAN, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. INSLEE, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. TALENT, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. SOUDER, Ms. DUNN, Mr. OSE, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. BAKER, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. CAMPBELL):

H.R. 4248. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act and the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act to prevent the proliferation of methamphetamine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GEJDENSON (for himself and Mr. LANTOS):

H.R. 4249. A bill to foster cross-border cooperation and environmental cleanup in Northern Europe; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. LAFALCE (for himself, Mr. VENTO, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. BENTSEN, Ms. CARSON, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mrs. JONES of Ohio):

H.R. 4250. A bill to amend the Home Ownership and Equity Protection Act of 1994 and other sections of the Truth in Lending Act to protect consumers against predatory practices in connection with high cost mortgage transactions, to strengthen the civil remedies available to consumers under existing law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. GILMAN (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. COX, Mr. SPENCE, and Mr. KNOLLENBERG):

H.R. 4251. A bill to amend the North Korea Threat Reduction Act of 1999 to enhance congressional oversight of nuclear transfers to North Korea, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 4252. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Isoxaflutole; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas:

H.R. 4253. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the expansion, intensification, and coordination of the activities of the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute with respect to research on pulmonary hypertension; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. BRYANT (for himself and Mr. TANNER):

H.R. 4254. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Bromoxynil Octanoate/Heptanoate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRYANT (for himself and Mr. TANNER):

H.R. 4255. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Bromoxynil Octanoate Tech; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 4256. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the exclusion of certain income of foreign sales corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOSTETTLER:

H.R. 4257. A bill to prohibit the use of Federal funds to give or withhold a preference to

a marketer or vendor of firearms or ammunition based on whether the manufacturer or vendor is a party to a covered agreement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KUYKENDALL:

H.R. 4258. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to improve the program for the forgiveness of student loans to teachers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma:

H.R. 4259. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the National Museum of the American Indian of the Smithsonian Institution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. NUSSLE (for himself, Mr. TANNER, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. BOYD, Mr. BUYER, Mr. CAMP, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. COOK, Ms. DANNER, Mr. EWING, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. GANSKE, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. GORDON, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. HAYES, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. LEACH, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. OSE, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. PHELPS, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. SOUDER, and Mr. STENHOLM):

H.R. 4260. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from net earnings from self-employment certain farm rental income and all payments under the environmental conservation acreage reserve program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PORTMAN:

H.R. 4261. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on certain methyl esters; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PORTMAN:

H.R. 4262. A bill to temporarily reduce the duty on certain methyl esters; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UDALL of New Mexico (for himself and Mr. UDALL of Colorado):

H.R. 4263. A bill to establish a compensation and health care program for employees and survivors at the Department of Energy facility in Los Alamos, New Mexico who have substained beryllium, radiation-related, asbestos, and hazardous substances injury, illness, or death due to the performance of their duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WALSH (for himself and Mr. HOLDEN):

H.R. 4264. A bill to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to encourage summer fill and fuel budgeting programs for propane, kerosene, and heating oil; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas (for herself, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr.

TOWNS, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. WYNN, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FATTAH, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. FORD, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. DELAULO, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. KLINK, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. FILNER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. REYES, Mr. FROST, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. MOORE, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. FALCOMA, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. SNYDER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. WEINER, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. COYNE, Mr. DIXON, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. FORBES, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. KILPATRICK, and Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin):

H.J. Res. 98. A joint resolution supporting the Day of Honor 2000 to honor and recognize the service of minority veterans in the United States Armed Forces during World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ARMEY:

H. Con. Res. 303. Concurrent resolution providing for a conditional adjournment of the House of Representatives and a conditional adjournment or recess of the Senate; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. GEJDENSON (for himself, Mr.

GILMAN, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Ms. CARSON, Mr. PHELPS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SUNUNU, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. UPTON, Mr. OBEY, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Ms. WATERS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. RIVERS, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. WEYGAND, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BERRY, Mr. PALLONE, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HOFFEL, Mr. BALDACCIO, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. WAMP, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. LINDER, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. STARK, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. REYES, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. WEINER, Mr. MINGE, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. WYNN, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. FROST, and Ms. DELAULO):

H. Con. Res. 304. Concurrent resolution expressing the condemnation of the continued egregious violations of human rights in the

Republic of Belarus, the lack of progress toward the establishment of democracy and the rule of law in Belarus, calling on President Alyaksandr Lukashenka's regime to engage in negotiations with the representatives of the opposition and to restore the constitutional rights of the Belarusian people, and calling on the Russian Federation to respect the sovereignty of Belarus; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. COBURN (for himself, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. PITTS, Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. DELAY, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. TERRY, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. SCHAFER, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. VITTER, Mr. MCINTOSH, and Mr. BRADY of Texas):

H. Con. Res. 305. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the presence of brain wave activity and spontaneous cardiac activity should be considered conclusive evidence of human life for legal purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCGOVERN (for himself, Mr. HORN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mrs. MORELLA):

H. Con. Res. 306. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress in support of the freeze on longer combination vehicles and current Federal limitations on truck size and weight; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. HOLT:

H. Res. 476. A resolution commending the present Army Nurse Corps for extending equal opportunities to men and women, and recognizing the brave and honorable service during and before 1955 of men who served as Army hospital corpsmen and women who served in the Army Nurse Corps; to the Committee on Armed Services.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 40: Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 72: Mr. WISE.
H.R. 252: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 531: Mr. KING and Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 803: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 842: Mr. TRAFICANT.
H.R. 904: Mr. TURNER and Ms. BALDWIN.
H.R. 1083: Mr. BASS.
H.R. 1168: Mr. FLETCHER and Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin.
H.R. 1287: Mr. NETHERCUTT.
H.R. 1329: Mr. GILCHREST.
H.R. 1593: Mr. HALL of Ohio.
H.R. 1839: Mr. SKELTON.
H.R. 1885: Mr. WYNN, Ms. DELAULO, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. WICKER, and Mrs. CLAYTON.
H.R. 2000: Mr. BONIOR, Mr. OSE, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. OLVER, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. FORBES, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. BACA, and Mr. PETRI.
H.R. 2265: Mr. DEFazio.
H.R. 2620: Mr. TURNER.
H.R. 2631: Mr. KILDEE and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
H.R. 2697: Mr. MCINTOSH.
H.R. 2722: Mr. FATTAH.
H.R. 2726: Mr. WHITFIELD and Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky.

H.R. 2733: Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 2776: Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 2784: Mr. BAKER.

H.R. 2812: Mr. HALL of Ohio, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, and Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

H.R. 3032: Mrs. MORELLA, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, and Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 3161: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.

H.R. 3219: Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. WAMP, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. CANADY of Florida, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. RAMSTAD, and Mr. COOKSEY.

H.R. 3248: Mr. DEMINT.

H.R. 3293: Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. BASS, Mr. CALAHAN, Mrs. BONO, Mr. REYNOLDS, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. COBURN, Mr. BORSKI, and Mr. DINGELL.

H.R. 3320: Mr. JEFFERSON and Mr. HOFFEL.

H.R. 3327: Mr. TANCREDI.

H.R. 3377: Mrs. JONES of Ohio.

H.R. 3413: Mr. MEEHAN, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. SAWYER, Ms. CARSON, Mr. CLAY, Mr. WEYGAND, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. FORBES, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. GREEN of Texas, and Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 3518: Mr. ARCHER, Mr. BAKER, and Mr. EWING.

H.R. 3546: Mr. NADLER, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. CARSON, Mr. ENGEL, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 3573: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 3628: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 3677: Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. METCALF, Mr. HAYWORTH, and Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 3825: Ms. ESHOO and Ms. KILPATRICK.

H.R. 3883: Mr. UDALL of Colorado.

H.R. 3915: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SAXTON, and Mr. KOLBE.

H.R. 3916: Mr. CAMP, Mr. CRANE, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. SHAW, Mr. WELLER, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. DANNER.

H.R. 3980: Mr. FOSSELLA.

H.R. 4022: Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. MANZULLO, and Mr. TANCREDI.

H.R. 4033: Mr. GIBBONS and Mr. EHRLICH.

H.R. 4046: Mr. DEFazio.

H.R. 4053: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, and Mr. TANCREDI.

H.R. 4064: Mr. SCHAFER, Mr. SOUDER, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. POMBO, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, Mr. HILL of Montana, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. PHELPS, Ms. DELAULO, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. TERRY, Mr. COBURN, Mr. MINGE, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mr. GOODE.

H.R. 4066: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 4076: Ms. STABENOW.

H.R. 4085: Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE.

H.R. 4086: Mr. HUNTER, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. THUNE, and Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.

H.R. 4118: Mr. TANCREDI.

H.R. 4131: Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 4132: Mr. SKEEN and Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 4144: Mr. WHITFIELD and Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 4154: Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. BAKER, and Mr. COOKSEY.

H.R. 4198: Mr. STEARNS, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. DOOLITTLE.

H.R. 4199: Mrs. WILSON.

H.R. 4207: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. WEINER, Mr. WELLER, Mr. MOAKLEY, and Mr. HYDE.

H.R. 4215: Mr. NETHERCUTT and Mr. FOLEY.

H.R. 4236: Mr. SOUDER.

H. Con. Res. 74: Ms. LOFGREN.

H. Con. Res. 249: Mr. DEFAZIO and Mr. VIS-CLOSKY.

H. Con. Res. 256: Mr. LATHAM, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Ms. BALDWIN.

H. Con. Res. 295: Mr. LANTOS.

H. Con. Res. 297: Mr. SOUDER.

H. Res. 398: Mr. WEYGAND, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. WYNN, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. VIS-CLOSKY, Mr. FILNER, Mr. PORTER, and Mr. LEVIN.

H. Res. 437: Mr. CASTLE.

H. Res. 464: Mr. WEXLER and Mr. CROWLEY.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 1824: Mr. KUCINICH.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 3439

OFFERED BY: MR. BARRETT OF WISCONSIN

AMENDMENT NO. 1: Page 4, beginning on line 9, strike paragraph (2) through line 20 and insert the following:

(2) REQUIRED DURATION OF MODIFICATION; PERMANENT CONDITIONS.—The Commission shall not modify such rules to eliminate or reduce the minimum distance separations for third-adjacent channels required by paragraph (1)(A) until 6 months after the date on which the Commission submits the report required by subsection (b)(3). No such elimination or reduction may remove such separations with respect to third-adjacent channels occupied by stations that provide a radio reading service to the public. The Commission shall not extend the eligibility for application for low-power FM stations beyond the organizations and entities as proposed in MM Docket No. 99-25 (47 C.F.R. 73.853).

Page 6, line 19, insert before the period the following: “, or 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, whichever is later”.

H.R. 3439

OFFERED BY: MRS. ROUKEMA

AMENDMENT NO. 2: At the end of the bill add the following new section:

SEC. 3. ADDITIONAL MODIFICATIONS.

In prescribing the modifications required by section 2(a), the Federal Communications Commission shall—

(1) permit FM commercial translators located in counties where there is no allocated commercial FM station, to locally originate commercial FM programming on an unlimited basis;

(2) require such translators to abide by the same rules as full service (high power) FM stations; and

(3) permit such translators to increase their radiated power to 100 watts, using a directional antenna, if necessary, to protect co-channel and first-adjacent channel stations.